

095094

JPRS-UPS-84-015

13 February 1984

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED

19980318 100

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

7
80
A05

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

13 February 1984

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL

Cordial Early U.S.-Soviet Relations Versus Present 'Stalemate' (G. N. Sevost'yanov; NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA, No 6, Nov-Dec 83).....	1
'U.S.-Israeli Arms Race' Threatens Developing Nations (A. Gromyko; NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA, No 6, Nov-Dec 83).....	24
Role of Marxism in National Liberation Movements Assessed (R. A. Ul'yanovskiy; NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTROIYA, No 6, Nov-Dec 83).....	29
USA Institute Official Writes on U.S. Space Militarization Plans (Andrey Kokoshin; VEK XX I MIR, No 12, Dec 83).....	45
Western Media Coverage of Soviet Space Problems, Ships Stranded in Arctic Assailed (A. Trush; ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, No 47, 22 Nov 83).....	51
Algerian Problems: Agriculture, High Birth Rate, Private Sector Economy (Yu. Mayorov, N. Shevtsov; TRUD, 11 Dec 83).....	56
Spanish Socialists' Record in Power Since Election Assessed (Vladimir Chernyshev; ZA RUBEZHOM, No 49, 2-8 Dec 83)....	59

NATIONAL

Kuznetsov Cites Literary Mission, Writer's Responsibility
(F. Kuznetsov; LITERATURNOYE OBOZRENIYE, No 10,
Oct 83) 71

Some Soviet War Movies Criticized
(O. Kuchkina; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 10 Jan 84) 76

INTERNATIONAL

CORDIAL EARLY U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS VERSUS PRESENT 'STALEMATE'

Moscow NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 83 (signed to press 9 Nov 83) pp 25-42

[Article by G. N. Sevost'yanov: "The Establishment of Diplomatic Relations Between the USSR and the United States Is an Important Milestone of International Life"]

[Text] The present international situation has been aggravated markedly as a result of the actions of the most aggressive imperialist circles. The danger of nuclear war, which threatens the very existence of mankind, has increased unprecedentedly. The main source of this danger is the anticommunist, anti-Soviet policy of the present U.S. Administration, which has openly proclaimed the reliance on force as the basic buttress of its global policy and has declared a "crusade" against communism. The Washington Administration is aiming at the putting together of a military coalition of imperialist powers, which is aimed against the USSR and the other socialist countries, against all democratic, progressive forces.

Since the first days of Great October the Soviet state has opposed the imperialist policy of dictation and aggression. The USSR was and remains a consistent opponent of the arms race, which is placing a heavy burden on peoples. "We firmly believe," General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Yu. V. Andropov stressed in a speech at the June (1983) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "that socialism in the end will demonstrate its advantages precisely under the conditions of peaceful competition with capitalism. And we are not at all supporters of the competition in the military area, which imperialism is imposing on us."¹

Soviet-American relations--the relations of the two greatest world powers--are playing a special role in modern international life. In order to eliminate the possibility of nuclear war, it is first of all necessary to change for the better the nature of the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. "In spite of the differences in the social system and in ideology," declared USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs A. A. Gromyko, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, "our two powers, powers of enormous military potential, can establish interrelations.... We appeal to the United States to approach more objectively the questions of Soviet-American relations and understand that normal, but even better good relations between the United States and the Soviet

Union meet not only the interests of the international situation as a whole, but also the interests of the American people. We have already spoken more than once of the fact that this would meet the interests of the Soviet people."²

The history of Soviet-American relations gives much evidence of how the logic of life and the understanding of the genuine national interests of our country led the most far-sighted political leaders of the United States to reject the untenable policy of open anticomunism and confrontation with the socialist country. One of them is the establishment of Soviet-American diplomatic relations, the 50th anniversary of which is being celebrated this year.

This act, which occurred in November 1933, met the ripe needs, interests and desires of both states and peoples. It played an important role in international life of the 1930's, contributed to the creation of an anti-Nazi coalition during the years of World War II and created the basis for normal relations between the two great powers of the present--the USSR and the United States.

Under the present conditions of the intensified confrontation of the two political courses--socialism and imperialism, when the aggressiveness of the ultra-reactionary forces headed by U.S. imperialism, which are making attempts at any cost to reverse development, has increased sharply, it is useful to turn to the lessons of history, which give confirmation of the fact that in the capitalist world "there are also other trends, other policies, which take more realistically into account the situation on the international arena. They understand that already irreversible processes have occurred in the world, they understand the necessity and mutual advantageousness of the long-term peaceful coexistence of the states with a different social system. We, on our part, have stated more than once and repeat that we are prepared for this. We are convinced that this meets the interests of the peoples on both sides of the social barricade which divides the world."³

In the foreign policy of the Soviet state relations with the United States hold an important place. Lenin's theses and ideas about the peaceful coexistence of states with a different social system have always constituted the basis of the political line of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government with respect to the United States. Back in May 1918 on the instructions of V. I. Lenin, who attached great importance to economic relations with the United States, a plan of the development of economic relations between Soviet Russia and the United States was prepared. This document was brought to the attention of President W. Wilson, but did not meet with understanding on the part of the American Government. Moreover, the United States became an active participant in the military intervention against Soviet Russia. On 18 February 1920 V. I. Lenin formulated the principles of peace with the United States in the following words: "Let the American capitalists leave us alone. We will leave them alone."⁴ While with regard to the development of economic relations he stated: "We are categorically in favor of an understanding with America--with all countries, but ESPECIALLY [in italics] with America."⁵

The U.S. Government responded to these peaceable constructive proposals with the policy of nonrecognition of the Soviet state and the refusal to establish

diplomatic relations with a country, in which the workers and peasants had taken power.

For 16 years the official circles of Washington adhered to this anti-Soviet course, pursuing a policy of the boycott and isolation of the USSR. They attempted by every means to discredit the Soviet regime and to achieve the overthrow of the socialist system.

But time passed relentlessly. The Soviet Union rapidly gained strength, making major gains in the building of the new, socialist society. The hopes and expectations of official Washington for the restoration of the old social order, which was hated by the working people, were not justified.

President Franklin Roosevelt, who entered the White House in early 1933, reflected, of course, just as the preceding American Presidents, the interests of his own class, the class of capitalists. But in contrast to other U.S. statemen Roosevelt was a more far-sighted, realistically thinking politician. And this showed in his stand with respect to the USSR. Understanding all the lack of promise of continuing the policy of the nonrecognition and disregard of the USSR, on 10 October 1933 he sent a message to M. I. Kalinin, the head of the Soviet state, in which he declared the abnormality of the situation, when two great powers for a long time did not have official relations. On 16 November 1933 the talks between President F. Roosevelt and USSR People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs M. M. Litvinov concluded with the signing of documents on the normalization of diplomatic relations, particularly with the exchange of notes, in which the USSR and the United States bound themselves to refrain from interference in each other's domestic affairs, not to encourage armed intervention against each other, as well as agitation and propaganda for the purpose of violating the territorial integrity of the other state or of changing by force its political and social system.⁶

Many works have been devoted to the study of the history of the establishment of Soviet-American diplomatic relations, both Soviet⁷ and American historians⁸ are showing an interest in this theme. New documents and materials, which are broadening our ideas about the facts and events which led to this act, are being published. They are making it possible to reconstruct more accurately the historical fabric of the development of events and to ascertain the degree of influence of some phenomena or others, which prompted the U.S. Government to enter the path of the recognition of the USSR.

The recognition of the USSR by the United States was due to an entire set of factors--of a political, economic, commercial, diplomatic and international nature.

Economic factors--the interest of business circles of the United States in trade with the Soviet state--were of great importance in the normalization of relations with the Soviet Union. The depression of 1929-1933 objectively intensified this trend, especially in connection with the sharp decline of American foreign trade. As statistics attest, while the commodity turnover of the United States with western states declined, USSR purchases of American goods increased. In particular, in 1931 the Soviet Union purchased 77.3 percent of the tractors exported by Americans and 57.3 percent of the machine

tools and was a major importer of mining and petroleum equipment.⁹ During 1929-1930 Soviet orders were filled at enterprises located in 36 states.¹⁰

The commodity turnover between the USSR and the United States reached its highest point in 1931. It could have also increased in subsequent years. However, the Administration of H. Hoover blocked the development of mutually advantageous trade, by using customs and currency restrictions and increased duties and placing Soviet purchasing organizations under unfavorable conditions. The established credits were issued at high interest rates and for short terms. Soviet organizations did not have a legal status in the United States. The reactionary circles of the United States launched a broad anti-Soviet campaign.

The policy of a boycott on trade with the USSR, which was pursued by the Hoover Administration, forced the Soviet Government to reduce orders to a minimum. In 1932 they had decreased by 86.2 percent as compared with the preceding year. Trade between the two countries was reduced sharply. At the same time Soviet orders increased appreciably in Germany, England and Italy. These changes were noticed at once by American companies. They regarded them as missed opportunities. The movement for recognition of the USSR intensified in business circles.

On 24 June 1932 the U.S. Chamber of Commerce published a memorandum, in which it was proposed to change the policy with respect to trade with the USSR. T. Morgan, a representative of the business circles, expressed dissatisfaction with the absence of an American ambassador and trade attache in Moscow, which had adversely affected the information on the potentials of the Soviet market. During the same month at a meeting of 200 industrialists and bankers of the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, which was founded in 1916, J. Senior, president of Cowham Engineering, expressed the desire to consider more rapidly the question of the establishment of normal relations with the USSR and the use of the Russian market for American goods.¹¹ Many industrialists of New York, Cleveland, Boston, San Francisco and other cities spoke in favor of the expansion of trade with the Soviet Union. Of the 50 surveyed firms 45 stated that the Soviet Union was a reliable trade partner which conscientiously meets its obligations. In all 22 firms spoke in favor of the immediate recognition of the USSR.¹²

In connection with the arrival of Franklin Roosevelt at the White House U.S. business circles began to speak more persistently in favor of the normalization of relations with the Soviet Union. On 21 March 1933 the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce appealed to C. Hull, the new Secretary of State, to review the policy with respect to the Soviet Union and to create more favorable opportunities for the development of trade with it.¹³

The statement of M. M. Litvinov at the International Economic Conference in London on 14 June 1933 on the willingness of the Soviet Government to place abroad orders for \$1 billion on the basis of the obtaining of long-term credits created an enormous impression on American exporters. The American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, of which such very large firms as General Electric, General Motors, American Locomotive, Thomas Edison and Chrysler were members, reacted to this with the publication on 12 July of a special bulletin, in which it was noted: "The London Conference has shown again the

disadvantage of the policy of nonrecognition." The United States must "act quickly and sensibly for the purpose of developing diplomatic and trade relations."¹⁴

The statement of M. M. Litvinov at the Economic Conference prompted C. Hull, head of the American delegation, to take diplomatic action. Confidentially he and U.S. delegation members H. Morgenthau, W. Bullit and R. Moley made personal contacts with M. M. Litvinov, which, in the words of the Secretary of State, laid the foundation for the discussion of the question of recognition.¹⁵ The appearance of an American diplomatic passenger car at the building of the Soviet Embassy in Kensington Palace Gardens caused at that time a sensation in diplomatic circles, as well as in the press. One of the American journalists said in this connection: "If Franklin Roosevelt has begun talks with Moscow and we find out about this, the forces of hell will rain down on him."¹⁶

The question of recognizing the USSR aroused debate in the Congress back in the early 1930's. Senator W. Borah spoke out especially actively. He repeatedly declared the importance of the normalization of Soviet-American relations and the development of trade between the two states.¹⁷ Democratic Senator B. Wheeler, having visited the USSR, published a series of articles on the life of the Soviet people and the importance of the Russian market for the United States.

Senators Barkley and Cutting, who visited the Soviet Union in 1930, called for the normalization of Soviet-American relations. On 22 April 1932 Congressman A. Sabath submitted to the Foreign Affairs Committee a resolution with the demand to establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Government. D. Robinson (Arkansas) and H. Rainy (Illinois), the Democratic leaders in the Senate and House of Representatives, and prominent Democratic Party figures Senators C. Swanson and R. Wagner spoke in favor of recognition. H. Rainy wrote: "Nearly all the countries of the world have recognized the Soviet Republic. They are all acting in order to achieve trade with Russia. We are sitting twiddling our thumbs, while our people remain without work. This is stupid."¹⁸ Former New York Governor A. Smith noted that the United States cannot endorse the Soviet system, but it does not have "any right to give instructions to another nation with respect to the form of government." Smith proposed to send to Moscow a mission for talks for the purpose of establishing diplomatic relations "on terms which are favorable for both countries."¹⁹

In December 1932 nine members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee spoke in favor of recognition, five spoke against, while seven refrained from taking a specific stand.²⁰ On 8 January 1933 of the 52 surveyed senators 23 were in favor of the normalization of Soviet-American relations, 9 were opposed, while 20 abstained. On 10 March Senator Bratton (New Mexico) submitted a petition which had been endorsed by the state senate. It was proposed in it to recognize the Soviet Union. On the same day Senator W. Borah for the seventh time invited the Senate to speak in favor of recognition of the USSR.²¹ Pennsylvania Governor G. Pinchot stated in January 1933: "It is most unwise to permit the European countries to take the place of the United States on Russian markets only because diplomatic channels are closed."²²

One should not, however, exaggerate the importance and strength of the supporters of the policy of recognition of the USSR in the American Congress, and not only in it. There were many more opponents, who took irreconcilable stands. Senators A. Robinson, A. Vandenburg, W. King and Oddie and Congressmen Hamilton Fish, Martin Dies and others spoke out most actively against the normalization of Soviet-American relations. They strove to smear the policy of the Soviet Government, to discredit the activity of Amtorg (a joint stock company which conducted trade between the USSR and the United States) and slandered the Communist Party of the United States in every way. The ad hoc committee for "the investigation of the activity of the USSR," which was created by the House of Representatives and was headed by H. Fish, submitted a report which abounded in anti-Soviet slanderous fabrications. "Soviet dumping" and "forced labor," which is ostensibly used in the Soviet Union, were discussed in it. It was proposed to close Amtorg and to deport the Soviet staff members from the United States, to establish an embargo on imports of manganese from the USSR, to introduce new immigration laws and not to allow foreign communists to enter the country. Even some American newspapers were forced to declare the Fish report unobjective, tendentious and "hysterical." The journal OUTLOOK found it "foolish and dangerous."²³ The reactionary press of the United States availed itself of the materials of the Fish committee for intensifying the anti-Soviet hysteria in the country. In striving to set the public against the Soviet Union, it launched a slander campaign with regard to the imaginary religious "persecutions" in the USSR. A special resolution on this question was submitted by the same Fish to the House of Representatives.

During the presidential election campaign in 1932 neither the Democratic nor the Republic Party devoted space and attention in their platforms to the issue of relations with the USSR. Foreign policy issues in general were little touched upon. The basic attention was focused on the unsolved problems which were connected with the depression and its consequences. However, the stands of both parties with respect to the Soviet Union were different.

The stand of the Republican Administration of Hoover was unequivocal and clearly delineated—not to recognize. It repeatedly declared this. On 16 April 1929 Secretary of State H. Stimson informed the American Federation of Labor that in the policy of the government with respect to the recognition of Soviet Russia no changes were foreseen.²⁵ On 25 August 1930 Assistant Secretary of State W. Castle reported confidentially to banker Bertron that the American Government did not intend to recognize the Soviet state and would not sign a trade agreement with it.²⁶ In December Stimson made an official statement for the press, which read: the recognition of the Soviet Government is ruled out, if it would not agree to the "preliminary terms" of the State Department.²⁷

On 26 May 1932, when Italian Ambassador to Washington G. de Martino asked Stimson, how correct the reports on the intention of the U.S. Government to recognize the Soviet Government were, a negative reply followed immediately. A few days later, on 9 June, the Secretary of State confidentially informed the diplomatic representations abroad that the Hoover Government was adhering firmly to the stand of nonrecognition of Soviet Russia.²⁸ During the election campaign Stimson on 8 September 1932 sent a letter to Senator Borah with the notice: the State Department did not intend to make any changes in the policy of nonrecognition of the USSR.²⁹ In this connection the following fact also

merits mention. When during the disarmament conference in Geneva in 1932 they suggested that Stimson meet with the Soviet delegate, he, having assumed an indignantly solemn pose and having lifted his arms up to the sky, exclaimed: "Never, never! Centuries will pass, but America will not recognize the Soviet Union."³⁰

F. Roosevelt as a far-sighted statesman understood the abnormality of the lack of diplomatic and trade relations between two very large powers as the United States and the USSR were, but did not show haste; he refrained from premature public statements, not wishing to bind himself with any obligations during the election campaign, watched the alignment of political forces closely and studied various opinions. However, it is safe to say that the relations of the United States and the USSR at that time had already aroused certain interest in him.

On 27 July 1932 Roosevelt spoke with W. Duranty, Moscow correspondent of THE NEW YORK TIMES, and, in his words, displayed "versatile interests in and a thorough knowledge of Soviet affairs."³¹ At the height of the election campaign, on 9 September 1932, Roosevelt met with engineer A. Hersh, who at that time worked as the chief consultant for the chemical industry in the USSR Supreme Council of the National Economy. He questioned him in detail about the development of the Soviet economy, about the prospects of Soviet-American trade and about Soviet-Japanese relations. Roosevelt "said frankly that Russia interests him very much," in his opinion, in the future it may become an enormous market for American goods, it is desirable to conclude a trade agreement with it. In case of his election as President "he would begin talks with the Soviets in order to come to an understanding on the establishment of relations, on recognition and so on."³² (A. Hersh informed Chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee V. I. Mezhlauk about this conversation. On 22 November, a few days after the election of Roosevelt as President, in a letter to banker W. V. Lancaster V. I. Mezhlauk expressed the hope that Roosevelt would find the time and an opportunity for the study of the "Russian question" and could draw favorable conclusions. The world situation, it was stated in the letter, "continues to be very favorable for the restoration of normal interrelations between our countries."³³ The Soviet Government would willingly support the initiative of the United States of America in this question.

On 4 December 1932 THE NEW YORK TIMES published a report under the characteristic title "Democrats Expect Recognition of USSR." On 9 January 1933 Roosevelt met with Stimson. During the meeting the policy of the United States with respect to Latin America was touched upon, much was said about the situation in the Far East and about the war debts which the European governments during the years of the depression had refused to pay. The question of recognition of the USSR was also a topic of discussion. Stimson strove to justify the policy of nonrecognition, which had been pursued by the Republican administrations.³⁴

After entering the White House, Roosevelt energetically busied himself first of all with the solution of domestic problems, having proclaimed the New Deal. The question of recognition of the USSR was not among the priority questions. However, it occupied many cabinet members, as well as Roosevelt

himself, who understood more than anyone the abnormality of the formed situation.

In the spring of 1933 Colonel R. Robins, former head of the American Red Cross mission in Russia and a prominent public figure of the United States, made a trip to Moscow. He had a meeting with People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs M. M. Litvinov and Deputy People's Commissar L. M. Karakhan. I. V. Stalin received him. From the conversations with them Robins formed the impression that the American initiative in recognizing the USSR would be favorably received by the Soviet side. After returning to the United States Robins tried to persuade the members of the Roosevelt Administration and its staff members of the desirability of normalizing relations with the USSR.

On 16 May 1933 the President sent to the heads of 53 states a message on the question of disarmament and the convening of the International Economic Conference. This appeal was also sent to the Government of the Soviet Union. A reply followed at once from Moscow. M. I. Kalinin, head of the Soviet state, supported the initiative of the President. The American press and public regarded this step as the first symptom of the rapprochement of the two states.

The State Department showed much activeness during this time, moreover, negative activeness. Many of its staff members spoke out against the normalization of relations with the USSR. On 27 July 1933 Under Secretary of State W. Phillips presented to Roosevelt a memorandum which had been prepared by R. Kelley, chief of the Division of East European Affairs. The preliminary terms of recognition of the USSR were set forth in it. Among them were: the repudiation by the Soviet Government of "world revolutionary goals," the recognition by it of the debts of the tsarist and Provisional Governments, the payment of the value of nationalized property, which had belonged to Americans, as well as... "the overcoming of the differences between the economic and social structure of the United States and Russia." In the memorandum it was stressed that "the monopoly of USSR foreign trade, the class nature" of the Soviet state, Soviet legislation and "the system of justice with respect to foreign citizens" as if prevented the normalization of relations.³⁵ The aspiration to convince Roosevelt, by the advancement of terms of negotiations, which were unacceptable in advance for the Soviet Government, of the impossibility of the normalization of Soviet-American relations was in essence the goal of this document.

In early August, after the return of Hull from London, where he had taken part in the International Economic Conference, the President decided to exchange views with the Secretary of State with regard to the recognition of the Soviet Union. Hull was cautious; he believed that the appropriate moment had not yet come. Concerning the discussion with the President, Hull subsequently noted in his memoirs: they shared views "in general outline, but did not come to any conclusions."³⁶

Meanwhile, events developed relentlessly in favor of recognition. On the instructions of Roosevelt, H. Morgenthau, chairman of the Farm Credit Administration, established personal contacts with representatives of Amtorg and displayed an interest in Soviet orders. He was informed of the willingness of the Soviet Union to purchase in the United States raw materials worth \$75 million on the condition of the obtaining of long-term credit.³⁷

In July 1933 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC) made a decision on the granting of credit to American exporters for the financing of the sale of 60,000-80,000 bales of cotton to the Soviet Union. The appeal of Amtorg to the RFC with a proposal on the financing of Soviet purchases received the support of presidential adviser R. Moley and H. Morgenthau. In the State Department they treated these proposals in a quite reserved manner. On 21 September Hull sent a memorandum to Roosevelt, in which he again reminded him of the great difficulties on the path of recognition of the Soviet Union, particularly the problem of debts and the nationalized property of American firms.³⁸ Three days later the Division of East European Affairs of the State Department recommended to Under Secretary of State W. Phillips to exert pressure by every means on the Soviet Government so that it would accept the "preliminary terms" before negotiations on recognition. On 5 October Hull presented Roosevelt with the memoranda of his assistants, W. Moore and W. Bullit, insisting on the reaching of an agreement with the Soviet Government on the debts before the start of negotiations on recognition.³⁹

President Roosevelt, however, approached differently the assessment of the situation and the settlement of the question of recognition of the USSR and viewed from a broader standpoint the development of events both within the United States and on the international arena.

The increased political, economic and military role of the Soviet Union in world politics and the increase of its international prestige prompted the U.S. Government to review the policy of nonrecognition. It was impossible not to take reality into account. At the same time the President as a more far-sighted politician than many from his surroundings saw that during the years of the depression the prestige of the United States in the world had declined significantly, the conflicts among the capitalist states had become extremely aggravated. Japan had seized a significant portion of the territory of China, had violated a number of international treaties and agreements and had struck a serious blow to the "open door" policy in China. This weakened the positions of the United States in the Far East and led to the straining of Japanese-American relations.

Some staff members of the State Department believed that recognition of the Soviet Union would be a definite restraining factor in the way of Japanese aggression. In particular, S. Hornbeck, chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs of the State Department, who in a memorandum of 14 March 1933 noted that in case of recognition of the Soviet Union Japan would be more cautious in its "impulsive actions" in the Far East, was of such an opinion.⁴⁰ Hornbeck probably came to such a conclusion on the basis of the dispatches received from Ambassador J. Grew from Tokyo, who 2 days after Roosevelt entered the White House reported to Washington: the Japanese were worried by the possibility of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and the United States. On 9 March he informed the State Department: in Tokyo they fear "American-Soviet rapprochement."⁴¹

Articles on the necessity of recognition of the USSR for the purpose of strengthening the shaken positions of the United States in the Far East began to appear in the U.S. press. The journals THE NATION and THE NEW REPUBLIC came out especially actively in this direction. Many senators and

congressmen admitted that the stand of Hoover with respect to Soviet Russia had worsened the position of the United States in the Far East and proposed to assess the role of the Far Eastern factor in the question of recognition of the USSR. Its importance became even more obvious in connection with the announcement of Japan on 27 March 1933 of its withdrawal from the League of Nations.

At the same time in Washington they could not but also take into account the development of events in Europe, where the Soviet Union consistently and actively spoke in favor of disarmament and the securing of peace and supported at international forums the principles of universal security. The initiative in drawing up a draft of a convention on the definition of aggression belonged to the USSR. In the interests of peace the Soviet Government supported the Kellogg Pact; in 1932 it concluded bilateral pacts on nonaggression and neutrality with a number of European countries: Finland, the Baltic states, Poland, France and Italy.

The Soviet Government appealed for the combining of the efforts of the countries, which had spoken out against the expansion of Japan in the Far East and the arming of the Wehrmacht. With the coming of Hitler to power the preparation of Berlin for the reshaping of the political map of Europe and the threat of world war increased. On 14 October Germany quit the disarmament conference, and 5 days later the League of Nations. Under these circumstances the American press and public began to speak more actively in favor of recognition of the USSR. The voices about the importance of the campaign of the Soviet Union as a great power for peace and security in the Far East and Europe rang out more and more loudly.

Under the conditions, when the clouds of war were thickening on the international horizon, the thoughts of Roosevelt dwelled on the role of the Soviet Union in the future development of international events, on the alignment of forces in the world, the "balance of forces" and the place of the United States in world politics. And the more he thought about this, the more obvious the lack of wisdom and near-sightedness of the policy of nonrecognition and the abnormality of the formed situation in Soviet-American relations became. It was impossible further not to take into account such a major economic, political and military force, into which the USSR had developed, with its increased prestige in international affairs. These considerations prompted Roosevelt to discuss once again with Hull the question of recognition of the USSR. And changes in the views of the latter had also occurred. Therefore, when the President expressed the idea of the desirability of normalizing relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, the head of the foreign policy department supported Roosevelt, having noted significantly: "As a whole Russia is a peace-loving country. The world is entering a dangerous period both in Europe and in Asia. Russia with time may provide considerable assistance in the stabilization of the situation, as the world is threatened more and more." Having fully agreed with this assessment, the President added: "The two great powers--America and Russia--should maintain normal relations. The restoration of diplomatic relations is advantageous for both countries."⁴²

The mood of the American public, to whom he, as the responsible executive of the country, could not but listen, also had a definite influence on the

President. In political and public circles the sentiments in favor of recognition of the USSR increased. The Society of Friends of the Soviet Union headed by well-known journalist Corliss Lamont took an active part in the organization of the campaign for recognition of the USSR. The members of this society disseminated books and pamphlets on the life of the Soviet people, on the building of socialism and on the successful fulfillment of the 1st Five-Year Plan. In February 1932 the society began to publish the journal SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY. Its readers learned that in the USSR unemployment had been eliminated, construction projects were experiencing an acute need for skilled workers. Many American workers appealed to Amtorg and the society to give them the opportunity to go to the USSR and to take a direct part in the construction of factories and plants. In 1931 about 2,500 U.S. workers were employed at Soviet industrial construction projects. In July 1932 on the initiative of the Society of Friends of the Soviet Union a technical bureau was organized in New York; 350 engineers and technicians became members of it. Branches of this bureau existed in a number of large cities of the United States, they gave assistance to Soviet organizations in the solution of technical problems and sent special literature to the USSR.⁴³

The society held meetings and rallies with the demand of recognition of the USSR. It disseminated 100,000 copies of leaflets and 20,000 copies of pamphlets devoted to the Soviet Union. By late 1933 departments of the society existed in 20 states. In February 1933 a campaign on the gathering of 1 million signatures on a petition with the demand of recognition of the Soviet Union was launched on their initiative.⁴⁴

In January 1933 800 professors and instructors of 268 colleges and universities in 45 states addressed a petition to Roosevelt, in which they insisted on recognition of the Soviet Union.⁴⁵ In the same month the (Independent Committee of the Movement for Recognition of Soviet Russia) was founded. New York lawyer (L. Landes) headed it. On 5 March in a specially adopted resolution the committee suggested that the President take specific steps--enter into talks with the Soviet Government on the terms of its recognition.⁴⁶

In March 1933 the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, which united a number of trade unions, demanded recognition of the USSR, while in May under the pressure of progressive forces the Continental Congress, in the work of which representatives of the Socialist Party, the Young People's Socialist League, trade unions and farmers took part, spoke out for recognition. The (Women's Committee in Favor of Recognition of Soviet Russia) was founded. The Trade Union Unity League, the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, the federations of labor of various states, many sectorial trade unions, women's and students' organizations and the American-Russian Institute of Cultural Relations With the Soviet Union spoke out in favor of recognition of the USSR.

Taking into account in combination the factors of an economic, political and international nature, as well as the mood of the public of the country, on 10 October 1933 Roosevelt sent a message to Chairman of the USSR Central Executive Committee M. I. Kalinin. The willingness to put an end to the abnormal situation, when the two great powers for such a long time were without direct official relations, was stressed in it. The President suggested that a representative of the Soviet Government be sent to Washington for talks with him personally.⁴⁷

On 13 October Roosevelt had a talk with R. Robins, who had returned shortly before from a trip about the Soviet Union, wishing to obtain more complete and reliable information about the USSR. The question: How would the diplomatic step being prepared by him be perceived in Moscow, interested the President.

The initiative of the U.S. President was greeted with satisfaction by the leaders of the Soviet state. In the reply of M. I. Kalinin attention was directed to the fact that the lack of normal relations between the two countries had adversely affected the international situation, had complicated the cause of securing peace and had encouraged the forces which were striving for its disturbance.⁴³

The exchange of messages between F. Roosevelt and M. I. Kalinin evoked animated reactions.

The democratic forces of the United States greeted with a sense of profound satisfaction the news about the forthcoming recognition of the USSR. Senators Borah, Norris, Reynolds and Adams greeted with fervor the actions of the President. The U.S. press came forth with an endorsement of the President's action. The newspaper THE NEW YORK WORLD TELEGRAM on 21 October published an editorial entitled "America and Russia Are Friends." On the same day THE HERALD TRIBUNE, a Republican Party organ, published an article entitled "Wall Street Bankers Support Quick Recognition of the USSR as a Stimulus for Trade With the United States."⁴⁹ Many newspapers, taking into account the development of international events, stressed the importance of the action of Washington. On 17 October B. Ye. Skvirskiy, chief of the Soviet Information Bureau in Washington, noting the sentiments in the political circles of the capital, reported to Moscow: "The actions of the Japanese and Germans are driving the Americans to establish relations with us."⁵⁰ The author of the report had reasons for such a conclusion. Back in late January 1932 B. Ye. Skvirskiy directed the attention of Senator Borah and several members of Congress to the need for recognition of the USSR, taking into account the expansion of Japanese aggression in the Far East. Recognition would contribute to the preservation of peace. Borah spoke with Stimson on this account, and the latter cited the hostile stand of President Hoover.⁵¹

On 30 October 1933 the Committee on Russian-American Relations, of which public figures and representatives of large companies were members, published a report entitled "The United States and Soviet Union." In the report it was noted that the Soviet Government had been governing the country already for 16 years; it enjoys the support of the population; the Soviet state was recognized by all the great powers except the United States; it is unwise to make the nonpayment of the debts of the prerevolutionary governments a reason to refuse to recognize Soviet Russia. "It is not the business of the United States," it was stated in the report, "to approve or not to approve of the form of government of another people, to be a kind of moral censor of the rest of mankind."⁵²

On 7 November 1933, on the anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, USSR People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs M. M. Litvinov arrived in Washington for talks. On the same day in an interview he directed the attention of the representatives of the American press to the existence of a firm

basis for economic, scientific and cultural cooperation in the interests of both states. Our countries, M. M. Litvinov stressed, "unite the common aspiration for peace."⁵³ The talks, which continued for 10 days, began on 8 November.

In the State Department they prepared carefully for the meeting with the Soviet representative. The staff members of the Division of East European Affairs had studied carefully all the treaties which had been concluded between the USSR and West European states. Up to 20 drafts of agreements were prepared by them. Each draft was discussed at conferences with the participation of F. Roosevelt, C. Hull, W. Phillips, H. Morgenthau and W. Bullit. Many proposals, which made recognition of the USSR conditional upon a number of provisions, were advanced.⁵⁴

At first C. Hull headed the talks on the American side. On 8 November 1933 during the meeting with M. M. Litvinov C. Hull started a conversation on religion. Litvinov replied that the information on religion, which the U.S. Government has, is the fruit of misinformation and one-sided propaganda. The opponents of recognition of the USSR were spreading absurd rumors with regard to the status of the church in the Soviet Union. Litvinov noted here that legislation on religion is a domestic affair of each state. When Hull demanded a guarantee of religious freedom in the USSR for Americans, having declared that otherwise the establishment of diplomatic relations was impossible, Litvinov made it clearly understood that the Soviet Government did not intend to grant any privileged status for Americans in religious matters.⁵⁵ The demands of Hull on a special legal status of Americans were also rejected.

Then the head of the U.S. foreign policy department posed the question of monetary claims. The Soviet representative advanced counterclaims for the damage done by Americans during the intervention of the United States against Soviet Russia. The commenced lengthy discussion about debts ended without result. The talk of the Secretary of States about the "propaganda of Comintern" was also rejected as groundless.

On the same day the talks were continued at the White House. The President already took part in them. They concerned primarily questions of international politics. The discussion participants admitted the existence of two sources of military danger. Japan and Germany were striving, the two sides stated, "for the seizure of foreign lands." After this Roosevelt turned to the theme of debts. Litvinov noted that this question was trivial as compared with the establishment of diplomatic relations between two such important countries as the USSR and the United States.

On the same day Litvinov sent a telegram to Moscow, in which he described his impressions about the first meetings with U.S. officials. He noted "the difference of the parties on all issues."⁵⁶ The second day also did not yield any results. The American side stuck to a rigid position, having advanced the thesis: first the settlement of problems, then recognition.

But soon the situation changed for the better, which to a considerable extent was connected with the departure of Hull for the inter-American conference in Montevideo. As of 11 November Roosevelt himself headed the talks, which was

of great importance. His conversations with M. M. Litvinov showed the willingness of the President to work out mutually acceptable solutions.

The progress of the talks has been covered in detail in Soviet literature,⁵⁷ and there is no need here to dwell on it. Let us note that the talks ended with an understanding on the normalization of diplomatic relations and the signing of important documents in the form of the exchange of notes and letters, as well as the signing of a joint memorandum. The exchange of notes, in which the USSR and the United States bound themselves to respect the sovereignty of both states, "to refrain from interference in any way in the domestic affairs" of each other, not to encourage armed intervention against each other, as well as agitation and propaganda for the purpose of violating the territorial integrity of the state or changing by force its political and social system, was the most important among them.⁵⁸

These documents were of fundamentally great importance in the interrelations between the two states. With the exchange of notes between the U.S. President and the USSR People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs confidence was expressed that both states "would be able to cooperate for their mutual benefit and for the protection of universal peace."⁵⁹

At the insistence of the President the Soviet side agreed to the preliminary sharing of opinions on mutual material claims. The United States insisted on the payment of all debts on the loans, which it had granted at one time to the tsarist and Provisional Governments, as well as on compensation for the nationalized property which had belonged to American owners. The Soviet Government declared that it did not bear any responsibility for the debts of the anti-popular governments. Nevertheless it was willing to meet several American material claims on the condition of the granting of a monetary loan to the Soviet Union and the recognition of Soviet claims. Moreover, the Soviet Government renounced the demand on the American side to compensate for the damage done by U.S. troops during the intervention in Siberia.⁶⁰ The willingness of the Soviet Government to pay the United States \$75 million in the form of additional interest on the loan, which would be granted by the United States, was recorded in the joint communique, which was initialed by M. M. Litvinov and F. Roosevelt. The President promised to convince the Congress to specify the amount of American claims at \$150 million. Serious differences existed on a number of issues, but the majority of them were successfully resolved. This proved to be possible owing to the fact that both parties had displayed an interest in the establishment of diplomatic relations. In the name of this they strove to find mutually acceptable solutions by means of compromise, mutual concessions and mutual understanding while observing the principle of equality and the respect of the sovereignty of each state.

The fact that the participants in the Soviet-American talks displayed realism and flexibility in the settlement of questions, a breadth of views and a thorough understanding of the basic trends in the development of international relations, was of great importance. It was clear that the world was on the eve of great events; formidable trials awaited it. The clouds of war had thickened over Asia and Europe. The strain of the situation imperatively required the rapprochement of the two great states--the USSR and the United States. This was an irrepressible demand of the times. It also prompted the U.S. President

to put an end to the unwise policy of nonrecognition of the Soviet Union. In the final conversation with M. M. Litvinov the U.S. President said much about the international situation, having devoted particular attention to the Pacific Ocean and the policy of Japan and having expressed the desire to expand trade between the United States and the USSR. Three days later M. M. Litvinov proposed to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce to conclude a trade treaty with the USSR.⁶¹

The successful conclusion of the Washington talks opened a new chapter in the history of Soviet-American relations. President F. Roosevelt expressed the hope that the relations between the Soviet and American peoples "will be able to remain normal and friendly forever and that our peoples henceforth will be able to cooperate for the sake of their mutual benefit and for the sake of the preservation of peace throughout the world."⁶² I. V. Stalin in a conversation with NEW YORK TIMES correspondent W. Duranty on 25 December 1933 stressed that the normalization of relations between the two important states--the USSR and the United States--is an act of enormous importance; politically the conditions of the preservation of peace are improving, economically the road for mutual cooperation is opening.

At the first meeting with U.S. Ambassador to Moscow W. Bullit, which took place on 15 December 1933, Chairman of the USSR Council of People's Commissars V. M. Molotov directed the attention of the American Ambassador to the fact that the most important area of Soviet-American cooperation is the cause of strengthening peace. "Two such countries as the USSR and the United States," the head of the Soviet Government said, "can do much for the preservation of peace, can to a significant extent paralyze the efforts which are aimed against the cause of peace."⁶³

Academician A. P. Karpinskiy, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, noted that the establishment of normal diplomatic relations between the USSR and the United States would be of benefit to the cause of universal peace, it "affords extensive opportunities for trade and for technical cooperation between us and America in the most different areas of the economy. At the same time vast opportunities for cooperation and the sharing of experience with scientific institutions of America are opening up for scientific institutions of the union."⁶⁴

The American public greeted with great satisfaction the normalization of Soviet-American relations. In a number of cities--New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Boston, Cleveland--rallies and meetings were held. Roosevelt received many telegrams and letters of greeting. In a telegram addressed to the President Senator Borah wrote: "Congratulations. This was wise and courageous with respect to the state." Senator Thomas declared: "This, of course, is a step forward."⁶⁵

When the President arrived at Warm Springs for the anniversary celebration of the state of Georgia, he found more than 300 telegrams and letters, in which the act of recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States was endorsed.⁶⁶

On the occasion of the successful conclusion of the talks and the recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States a large reception, which about

2,000 people attended, was organized on 24 November in New York on the initiative of the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce. The hall was decorated with Soviet and American flags. The tune "The International" sounded solemnly. In addressing the welcoming speech to the banquet participants, engineer Hugh Cooper, chairman of the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, acknowledged the great achievements of the Soviet people in the building of a new society and noted that the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and the USSR was "a prime factor of international peace."⁶⁷ M. M. Litvinov, who dwelled on the prospects of cooperation between the two states, delivered a major speech. He expressed confidence that economic cooperation between the USSR and the United States would be beneficial to both countries, while "the cultural cooperation of figures of science and art would yield abundant fruits."⁶⁸

The news about the diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States was received in different ways in the capitals of the world. In Berlin they openly expressed discontent with the planned rapprochement of the USSR and the United States. In Tokyo they were worried: many Japanese leaders did not anticipate such a step on the part of the United States and the news about it took them by surprise. The comments of a number of semi-official Japanese newspapers ((NITSI NITSI), (TSUGAYO SIOGIO), (KUKUMIN), (DZI DZI), (ASAKHI)) were of an anti-Soviet nature. A representative of the Japanese Ministry of War stated: "It may be thought that recognition to a certain degree means the putting of pressure on Japan."⁶⁹

It should be noted that if the United States and the USSR had acted as a united front against Japanese aggression, the military and political events in the Far East and the Pacific Ocean on the eve of World War II, perhaps, would have developed differently. It would have been possible by the joint efforts of the two great Pacific Ocean powers to prevent the tragedy at Pearl Harbor. However, the opposition of influential isolationist circles of the United States, which did not want to consider the increased real danger of Japanese aggression for all the states of the Pacific Ocean Basin, including the United States, did not make it possible to combine the efforts of the states and peoples during this crucial period of history. This also did not occur in Europe, where the Soviet Union persistently appealed for the creation of a system of collective security against the armed aggressive actions of Germany and Italy. If the aspirations of the Soviet Union, which were aimed at the strengthening of the front of peace-loving people, had received support on the part of the western powers, such obstacles, which the supporters of war would have hardly been able to overcome, would have been created.

In spite of the many obstacles erected by the opponents of Soviet-American cooperation, the normalization of relations in 1933 was a historical prerequisite for the establishment of a military-political alliance between the USSR and the United States during the years of World War II. These two great states and peoples found themselves in one mighty coalition against the common enemy. They pooled material and human resources for the gaining of victory jointly with other peoples over Fascist Germany and its allies. The decisive contribution of the Soviet Union to the rout of Nazi Germany received universal recognition. In 1945 General Stilwell wrote that Americans should give due credit to the Russian soldier for his selfless defense, first of all the

epic resistance at Stalingrad, where the 6th German Army was destroyed and the course of the war was turned toward final victory. During all the years of the war Americans saw that the Soviet soldier "bore the entire burden of the onslaught of the Germans and defeated them. They surpassed all the achievements of Russian soldiers in past wars, and all soldiers of any nationality are proud that they were united with them in this war. The entire civilized world should especially value the services of the central figure in this struggle--the Russian soldier."⁷⁰

During the 1944 presidential election campaign Roosevelt with good reason declared to the American people that recognition of the Soviet Union had completely justified itself and had played an enormous role in the matter of the organization of the victory of freedom-loving peoples over Nazi Germany.⁷¹

The military cooperation of the peoples of the USSR and the United States during the years of World War II demonstrated the effectiveness of the alliance of the great powers in the interests of peace. In the relations among the states of the anti-Nazi coalition, as is known, difficulties existed, differences, which at times were of a significant nature, arose. However, they were overcome, the most complicated problems of world politics were successfully solved. As a whole the cooperation in the anti-Nazi coalition became a clear example of the possibility and necessity of the peaceful coexistence of states with a different social system in the common interests in the struggle against fascism and for peace.

The history of the relations between the USSR and the United States is confirmation of how good relations between these states yield valuable fruits for both the Soviet and the American peoples, as well as the peoples of other countries. The policy of alienation and enmity is at variance with their vital national interests.

At the end of World War II President Roosevelt, fearing the increase of the activeness of conservative elements, who spoke out against cooperation with the Soviet Union, taking into account the difficulties and complexities of the postwar problems of the establishment of peace and thinking about the prospects of the development of Soviet-American relations after the war, shortly before his death, in January 1945, said in a radio speech: "Peace can be achieved and preserved only by the common resolve of free and peace-loving peoples, who wish to work together, wish to respect and be tolerant of each other and try to understand the opinion and mood of each other. In the future world the abuse of power, which lies hidden in the very term 'power politics,' should not be the dominant factor of international life."⁷²

The fears of Roosevelt, unfortunately, proved correct. Soon after his death the Truman Administration embarked on the path of a "position of strength" policy and a "hard line" with respect to the Soviet Union. As a result the trust between the USSR and the United States was violated, the aggravation of tension, and then the long years of the Cold War set in.

The first half of the 1970's was marked by the coming of detente. At this time the political and legal basis for the development of mutually advantageous cooperation between the USSR and the United States was laid. Important treaties and agreements, which were aimed at the normalization of

relations between the two great powers, were concluded. The document "The Principles of the Interrelations Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America" (1972), in which it was acknowledge that no other basis for the maintenance of Soviet-American relations except peaceful coexistence exists during the nuclear age, was of fundamental importance. The parties to the agreements, which were signed in Moscow in 1972, came to the agreement to adhere to the principle of equal security and to do everything which depends on them, so that conflicts or situations, which are capable of increasing international tension, would not arise, and to help so that all countries would live under the conditions of peace and security.

The conception of the place and role in the modern world of Soviet-American relations, on the state and development of which the overall atmosphere of international life in many ways depends, in essence was formulated in these documents, which are of great political importance.

As a result of detente between the USSR and the United States changes were noted in economic and trade relations, in scientific and cultural contacts. Thus, in a short time by negotiations much was achieved in the solution of the most important problems of the present. Then on the initiative of the Soviet Union the question of the further intensification of the process of detente, its materialization and the reorganization of international relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence was placed on the agenda. It was important to augment political detente with military detente.

However, the coming to power in the United States of military imperialist powers, which set as their goal to torpedo detente and to return to the "position of strength" policy, shows that during the struggle of the two trends in the United States in the approach to the Soviet Union the aggressive forces in recent years have gained the upper hand.

"The present American Administration," A. A. Gromyko noted at a press conference in New York in June 1982, "is very successfully destroying the bridges which were erected in the course of tens of years, one after the other." The Reagan Administration, having advanced again the idea of the "world domination" of the United States and having relied on global confrontation with the USSR, including nuclear confrontation, is materializing this idea in the adventuristic course of achieving nuclear superiority. The United States has taken the path of launching an unprecedented arms race in all directions and is building up international tension to the limit. Seized by militaristic intoxication, the U.S. Administration is striving to deploy new nuclear missile weapons in Western Europe and to use the arms limitation talks as a cover of its plans of the unrestrained buildup of means of mass destruction.

The open declarations of U.S. leaders about the readiness to inflict the first nuclear strike are causing the deep anxiety of the world public. A mighty movement of advocates of peace has developed against the threat of nuclear war. It is also spreading among the American people. The simple people are convinced that only the policy of the peaceful coexistence of states with a different social system can be the only rational alternative to a nuclear catastrophe.

The constructive solution of cardinal problems of international life found embodiment in the Peace Program for the 1980's, which was approved by the 26th CPSU Congress. Characterized by profound realism and great humanism, it indicated specific means of the aversion of the threat of nuclear war, the relaxation of tension, the improvement of the political climate, the establishment of an atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding between states and the solution of controversial problems by means of negotiations. "Our goal is not simply the prevention of wars," Yu. V. Andropov declared at the June (1983) CPSU Central Committee Plenum. "We are striving for the radical improvement of international relations, the strengthening and development of all the good principles in these relations. We will seek the respect of the sovereign rights of states and peoples, the strict observance of the principles of international law, which imperialism is attempting more and more often to reject, to trample."⁷³

As to Soviet-American relations, which have been aggravated in recent times as a result of the aggressive policy of the ruling circles of the United States, as General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Yu. V. Andropov stressed during a conversation with American senators on 18 August 1983, "the Soviet Union would like to have with the United States such a level of harmony, which would ensure normal, stable, good relations, to the advantage of both parties and to the great benefit of the cause of universal peace."⁷⁴

The peoples of the world urgently sense the need for the improvement of Soviet-American relation, for which--such are the dictates of the times!--the principles of the peaceful coexistence of states with a different social system, mutual trust and noninterference in the domestic affairs of each other and the aspiration for the prevention of the possibility of the occurrence of a nuclear war and for the strengthening of peace and universal security for the peoples of all countries should be the basis.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Materialy Plenuma Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS, 14-15 iyunya 1983 goda" [Materials of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, 14-15 June 1983], Moscow, 1983, p 25.
2. PRAVDA, 3 April 1983.
3. "Materialy Plenuma Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS, 14-15 iyunya 1983 goda," p 24.
4. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Works], Vol 40, p 145.
5. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch.," Vol 39, p 209.
6. "Dokumenty vnesheiny politiki SSSR" [USSR Foreign Policy Documents], Vol XVI, Moscow, 1970, p 642; "Foreign Relations of the United States. Diplomatic Papers" (hereinafter FR), Vol 2, 1933, pp 805-806.

7. V. Ivanov, V. Leonyan, "V interesakh narodov. K voprosu ob ustanovlenii diplomaticeskikh otnosheniy mezhdu SSSR i SShA" [In the Interests of the Peoples. On the Question of the Establishment of Diplomatic Relations Between the USSR and the United States], Moscow, 1957; N. N. Yakovlev, "Noveyshaya istoriya SShA. 1917-1960" [Modern U.S. History. 1917-1960], Moscow, 1961; V. K. Furayev, "Sovetsko-amerikanskiye otnosheniya 1917-1939" [Soviet-American Relations of 1917-1939], Moscow, 1964; V. A. Val'kov, "SSSR i SShA (ikh politicheskiye i ekonomicheskiye otnosheniya)" [The USSR and the United States (Their Political and Economic Relations], Moscow, 1965; G. N. Tsvetkov, "Shestnadtsat' let nepriznaniya. Politika SShA v otnoshenii Sovetskogo gosudarstva v 1917-1933 gg." [Sixteen Years of Nonrecognition. U.S. Policy With Respect to the Soviet State During 1917-1933], Kiev, 1971.
8. W. S. Meyers, "The Foreign Policies of Herbert Hoover, 1929-1933," New York-London, 1940; Ch. Beard, "American Foreign Policy in the Making, 1932-1940. A Study in Responsibilities," New Haven, 1946; W. A. Williams, "American-Russian Relations, 1781-1947," New York-Toronto, 1952; R. P. Browder, "The Origins of Soviet-American Diplomacy," Princeton, 1953; R. Ferrell, "American Diplomacy in the Great Depression: Hoover-Stimson Foreign Policy, 1929-1933," New Haven, 1957; G. F. Kennan, "Russia and the West Under Lenin and Stalin," Boston-Toronto, 1961; D. Bishop, "The Roosevelt-Litvinov Agreements," Syracuse, 1965; B. Farnsworth, "William C. Bullit and the Soviet Union," Bloomington-London, 1967; P. Filene, "Americans and the Soviet Experiment, 1917-1933," Harvard University Press, 1967; Jan Hoff Wilson, "Ideology and Economics. U.S. Relations With the Soviet Union, 1918-1923," Columbia, 1974; J. U. Gaddis, "Russia, the Soviet Union and the United States: An Interpretive History," New York-Toronto, 1978.
9. "Sovetsko-amerikanskiye otnosheniya, 1919-1933. Sbornik dokumentov po mezhunarodnoy politike i mezhunarodnomu pravu" [Soviet-American Relations, 1919-1933. A Collection of Documents on International Politics and International Law], Moscow, 1934, pp 98-99.
10. See V. K. Furayev, Op. cit., p 205.
11. ECONOMIC REVIEW OF THE SOVIET UNION, 1 April 1932, pp 158-159; 15 April 1932, p 175.
12. V. K. Furayev, Op. cit., p 211.
13. W. A. Williams, Op. cit., p 236.
14. PRAVDA, 14 July 1933; IZVESTIYA, 14 July 1933.
15. "The Memoirs of Cordell Hull," Vol 1, New York, 1948, pp 293-294; "Franklin Roosevelt and Foreign Affairs," Vol 1: January 1933-February 1934, New York, 1959, pp 293-294.
16. PRAVDA, 18 November 1973.

17. R. J. Maddox, "William E. Borah and American Foreign Policy," Baton Rouge, 1969.
18. THE NATION, 18 May 1932, p 567.
19. "Congressional Record" (hereinafter CR), 73d Congress, 4 May-24 May 1933, Vol 77, Part 2, pp 1545-1546.
20. "The New International Year Book. A Compendium of the World's Progress for the Year 1932," New York, 1933, p 804.
21. CR, 73d Congress, 1st Session, 9 March-3 April 1933, Vol 77, Part 1, pp 113, 125.
22. IZVESTIYA 25 January 1933.
23. OUTLOOK, No 157, 1931, p 127.
24. CR, 71st Congress, 2d Session, 19 February 1930, p 3692.
25. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 30 April 1929.
26. R. P. Browder, Op. cit., p 40.
27. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 7 December 1930.
28. G. N. Tsvetkov, Op. cit., p 138.
29. FR, Vol 2, 1933, pp 778-779.
30. "Istoriya vnesheiny politiki SSSR" [The History of USSR Foreign Policy], Vol I, 1917-1945, edited by B. N. Ponomarev, A. A. Gromyko and V. M. Khvostov, Moscow, 1966, p 277.
31. W. Duranty, "I Write as I Please," London, 1945, p 298.
32. "On the Establishment of Relations Between the USSR and the United States (The Publication of Documents)," Istoricheskiy Arkhiv, No 2, 1960, pp 104-105.
33. Istoricheskiy Arkhiv, No 1, 1961, pp 13-14.
34. R. Ferrell, Op. cit.
35. FR, Vol 2, 1933, pp 782-788.
36. "The Memoirs of Cordell Hull," Vol 1, p 294.
37. J. M. Blum, "From the Morgenthau Diaries. Years of Crisis, 1928-1938," Boston, 1959, p 55.
38. "The Memoirs of Cordell Hull," Vol 1, p 294.

39. FR, Vol 2, 1933, pp 791-794.
40. B. Farnsworth, Op. cit., p 208.
41. FR, Vol 3, 1933, p 299; G. N. Tsvetkov, Op. cit., p 195.
42. "The Memoirs of Cordell Hull," Vol 1, p 297.
43. SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY, March 1933, p 18; August 1933, p 12. See V. K. Furayev, Op. cit., p 228.
44. G. N. Tsvetkov, Op. cit., p 203.
45. PRAVDA, 30 January 1933.
46. PRAVDA, 2 February 1933, 8 March 1933.
47. "Dokumenty vneshney politiki SSSR," Vol XVI, pp 564-565.
48. Ibid., p 565.
49. THE HERALD TRIBUNE, 21 October 1933.
50. "Dokumenty vneshney politiki SSSR," Vol XVI, p 576.
51. "Dokumenty vneshney politiki SSSR," Vol XV, Moscow, 1969, p 80.
52. Committee on Russian-American Relations of the American Foundation, "The United States and Soviet Union," New York, 1933, pp 4-7. See G. N. Tsvetkov, Op. cit., pp 177-178; V. K. Furayev, Op. cit., p 225.
53. "Dokumenty vneshney politiki SSSR," Vol XVI, p 605.
54. "The Memoirs of Cordell Hull," Vol 1, pp 299-301.
55. "Dokumenty vneshney politiki SSSR," Vol XVI, p 608.
56. Ibid., p 610.
57. V. K. Furayev, Op. cit., pp 214-250; V. Ivanov, V. Leonyan, Op. cit., pp 89-124; G. N. Tsvetkov, Op. cit., pp 209-225; see also D. Bishop, Op. cit.
58. "Dokumenty vneshney politiki SSSR," Vol XVI, pp 642-644; FR, Vol 2, 1933, pp 805-806.
59. "Dokumenty vneshney politiki SSSR," Vol XVI, p 641.
60. Ibid., p 654; FR, Vol 2, 1933, p 814.
61. "Dokumenty vneshney politiki SSSR," Vol XVI, pp 658-660, 667.

62. "Sovetsko-amerikanskiye otnosheniya, 1919-1933," p 77.
63. "Dokumenty vneshney politiki SSSR," Vol XVI, p 750.
64. ARKHIV AKADEMII NAUK SSSR, Folio 265, Opus 3, File 41; Ya. Kumok, "Karpinskiy Aleksandr Petrovich" [Aleksandr Petrovich Karpinskiy], Moscow, 1978, p 254.
65. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 18 November 1933.
66. IZVESTIYA, 22 November 1933.
67. IZVESTIYA, 26 November 1933.
68. "Vneshnyaya politika SSSR" [USSR Foreign Policy], Vol III, 1925-1934, Moscow, 1945, p 683; "Dokumenty vneshney politiki SSSR," Vol XVI, p 687.
69. See V. Ivanov, V. Leonyan, Op. cit., p 133.
70. IZVESTIYA, 3 May 1945.
71. "The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin Roosevelt, 1944-1945," New York, 1950, pp 344-345.
72. Ibid., pp 512-513.
73. "Materialy Plenuma Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS, 14-15 iyunya 1983 goda," p 25.
74. PRAVDA, 19 August 1983.

Sevost'yanov, Grigoriy Nikolayevich, Doctor of Historical Sciences, editor in chief of the journal NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA, chief of the Sector of History of the United States of America and Canada of the Institute of General History of the USSR Academy of Sciences, author of the monographs "Politika velikikh derzhav na Dal'nem Vostoke nakanune vtoroy mirovoy voyny" [The Policy of the Great Powers in the Far East on the Eve of World War II] (Moscow, 1961), "Podgotovka voyny na Tikhom okeane" [The Preparation of War in the Pacific Ocean] (Moscow, 1962), "Diplomaticeskaya istoriya voyny na Tikhom okeane" [A Diplomatic History of the War in the Pacific Ocean] (Moscow, 1962), "Diplomaticeskaya istoriya voyny na Tikhom okeane ot Pirl-Kharbora do Kaira" [A Diplomatic History of the War in the Pacific Ocean From Pearl Harbor to Cairo] (Moscow, 1969), "Tomas Dzhefferson" [Thomas Jefferson] (in joint authorship, Moscow, 1976) and many other works, as well as chapters in collective works on the history of the United States and international relations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Novaya i noveyshaya istoriya", 1983.

7807

CSO: 1800/202

INTERNATIONAL

'U.S.-ISRAELI ARMS RACE' THREATENS DEVELOPING NATIONS

Moscow NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 83
(signed to press 9 Nov 83) pp 8-11

[Article by Anat. A. Gromyko, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "The Arms Race and the Developing Countries"]

[Text] The most most sinister reality of our age is the threat of nuclear catastrophe hanging over the world. A nuclear storm unleashed on our planet would inevitably result in the paralysis and demise of human civilization. This cannot be permitted. Moreover, it must be opposed by all the forces of human reason expressed, in particular, in the adoption of political decisions.

Precise scientific data on the consequences of nuclear war for mankind, as reported by authoritative scientists, indicate that this kind of war will really lead to the end of the world, and this is will not be the kind of religious mysticism in the spirit of the biblical revelations about the destiny of man. No, it would be a truly tragic "latter end" for all people whatever their world outlook and attitude. Not only millions and millions of workers would die, but the millionaires and billionaires and the bankers and those politicians who now throw out the phrases about there being things that are more important than peace would also cease to exist.

I note, apropos, that the critical state of international relations today is largely explained by the fact that right-thinking people in the U.S. business world who do not link their destinies to the arms race, have lost, at least at present, control over the political figures who have formed the intention of acting in international affairs by relying on the crude methods of military pressure, threats against socialism and whipping up a war psychosis.

Those who love these methods have still failed to recognize the simple truth that today, as a result of the attempts to brush aside the interests of the Soviet Union's security, the security of the United States has become weaker than earlier, when detente was gaining strength and a number of Soviet-U.S. agreements that stabilized international life were concluded.

The greater part of the world community is made up by the liberated countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. The peoples of these states are recognizing

with increasing clarity the threat to themselves from nuclear war. There are several reasons for their growing anxiety.

The developing countries are deeply alarmed by the fact that a possible nuclear clash in Europe and North America will quickly grow into a nuclear catastrophe on a world scale that will involve all continents. In her message to the UN General Assembly Second Special Session on Disarmament, no less a politican of many years experience as the prime minister of India, Indira Gandhi, stated: "This new kind of barbarity--nuclear war--beings destruction not only to the belligerent countries but also to the peoples of the nonaligned and neutral states." *

These words reflect the true state of affairs. A weak industrial base, a high population density within limited fertile regions, a primitive infrastructure, poor medical services--even these sample characteristics of many developing countries make them particularly susceptible in the event of nuclear war. Moreover, as they whip up the arms race the imperialist powers are involving the developing countries in it increasingly, forcing their governments to allocate increasing amounts for military purposes and diverting their material resources from creative aims.

The countries of the so-called "third world" fear that they may become the object of nuclear blackmail or the direct use of nuclear weapons in the event of a U.S. attack on the USSR. The Falklands crisis showed that the use of its arsenal by a nuclear power against one of the developing countries is not an unreal prospect. In this case, London conducted what was for the nonaligned countries an extremely instructive and also very dangerous experiment.

This is why the developing countries are speaking out against the arms race. In general they are active supporters of virtually all proposals in which the need to struggle against the nuclear threat is pointed out. As long ago as the UN General Assembly First Special Session on Disarmament it was precisely these countries (along with the USSR and the other socialist states) that worked together for the inclusion of the following points in the session's final document: "Now, as never before, mankind faces the threat of self-destruction as the result of the continuing competition in the matter of stockpiling on enormous scales the most destructive armaments ever produced..."

"Eliminating the threat of world war--nuclear war--is today's most urgent and pressing problem."**

The 7th Conference of Heads of Nonaligned States (March 1983) expressed itself in the same spirit. The Delhi Appeal adopted by the conference states: "Speaking on behalf of a majority of the world community, the nonaligned states call for an immediate halt to the slide toward nuclear conflict which threatens the well-being of mankind."

* UN document AS/12/PY 9, 11 June 1982.

** UN document A/S-10/2, 30 June 1978.

Neither should another factor that is causing deep anxiety in the developing countries be forgotten. U.S. nuclear weapons, which are being deployed further and further from the borders of the United States, are creating a real threat to countries that are located in what would seem to be the most remote parts of the world. The missiles whose deployment is planned for late 1983 in West Europe, are closer to Africa and Asia. Thus, U.S. missiles on Sicily could be used against Libya.

In his opening address to the UN General Assembly Second Special Session on Disarmament, the UN secretary general Javier Perez de Cuellar stated that "a general nuclear confrontation will affect the entire world and the entire ecosystem."* In recent years the danger of nuclear war for the developing countries has started to be regarded as part and parcel of the same thing. It is a question of the possible consequences of global nuclear war for the tropical zones, the deserts, and the expanses of the ocean. Most of the liberated countries are located precisely in these zones. Recent studies have shown that the detonation of nuclear charges in these regions will unbalance their ecosystems, which have taken millions of years to become established.** These ecosystems are the most fragile and unstable and therefore any disruption will do very severe damage. One graphic proof of this is the fate of Bikini Atoll, where the United States conducted nuclear tests. When they permitted the local inhabitants to return to their homeland in 1969 the American authorities quickly found that the radioactivity in the soil had not been eliminated. Surveys conducted by scientists show that it will not be safe to live on the atoll for another 60 to 90 years.***

An increasing number of the developing countries are calling for a freeze on the nuclear arsenals, complete and general halting of nuclear weapon testing, and measures for nuclear disarmament. A desire to secure themselves from the probability of being drawn into a nuclear conflict lies at the basis of the numerous proposals by the developing countries for the creation of nuclear-free zones--in Africa, the Near East, South Asia, Latin America (in this last-named case there is an existing treaty on banning nuclear weapons in Latin America, namely the Tlatelolco Treaty).

It is essential to make mention of yet another important factor. Many of the countries of Asia and Africa lie under the threat that nuclear weapons might be used by states hostile to them (Israel, the Republic of South Africa) in local conflicts in countries bordering on them directly.

For quite justified reasons the African countries fear the military nuclear potential of the racist Republic of South Africa. It has at its disposal

* UN document A/S-12/PY.I, p 18

** "Warfare in a Fragile World," SIPRI, 1980

*** US NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 18 Oct 82

a highly developed nuclear industry, with enormous reserves of uranium in South Africa itself and in Namibia, which it occupies. The Republic of South Africa does not adhere to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and it has repeatedly and publicly refused to do so.

Uranium-enrichment plants have been operating in the Republic of South Africa since 1961, and in 1977 a start was made on enrichment using another method. If we take into account the fact that the maximum amount of highly enriched uranium needed for a 20-kiloton explosive device is 15-25 kilograms, then already by August 1977 the Republic of South Africa could have possessed sufficient material to create two bombs.* In 1980 the Republic of South Africa possessed about 203 kilograms of highly enriched uranium, and by the end of 1984 this figure will have been increased to 400 kilograms. The Republic of South Africa also possesses nuclear-weapon delivery systems. At the same time it has refused to adopt the guarantee of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) with regard to its own nuclear program and refuses to cooperate in creating a nuclear-free zone in Africa.

The constant threat to the African states inherent in the military nuclear potential of the Republic of South Africa has been one of the main reasons why they have raised the question of making all of Africa, including the offshore islands, including Madagascar, a nuclear-free zone. Since 1961 the UN General Assembly has regularly been adopting resolutions calling for the creation of such a zone, and also for an end to cooperation with the Republic of South Africa in the nuclear field. The Declaration on the Creation of a Nuclear-Free Zone in Africa, adopted by the Organization of African Unity as long ago as 1964, was approved by the UN General Assembly in 1965, and since then has been repeatedly confirmed. Resolutions adopted by the UN General Assembly in the fall of 1982 called for all states to regard Africa as a nuclear-free zone and condemned the racist regime in the Republic of South Africa for the buildup of its nuclear potential, and also cooperation with it by western states in the nuclear field (the United States, Britain, France and Israel voted against the resolution).

The dangerous development of events is there for all to see. The independent African states are trying to secure themselves against the presence of nuclear weapons in Africa, while the racists opposing this are receiving support from the United States.

The military nuclear potential of Israel is a serious source of uneasiness for the countries of the Arab world. Like the Republic of South Africa, Israel does not adhere to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. At the same time it has a developed atomic industry. Since 1964, when the Dimona research reactor was commissioned, Israel has been able to produce sufficient plutonium to make a considerable number of explosive devices. This reactor is the only one in the Near East not subject to the IAEA guarantee. Israel possesses nuclear-weapon delivery systems (aircraft and missiles) and, according to UN experts, could possess nuclear weapons, considering its technical potential and experienced personnel.**

* "Plans and Potential of South Africa in the Nuclear Field. Report of the Secretary General." UN document A/35/402, 1981, pp 9, 28.

** "Israel's Nuclear Armament. Report of the Secretary General." UN document A/36/431, 18 September 1981.

Misgivings that Israel might pursue a course toward the use of nuclear weapons increased after the Israeli air force bombed the Iraqi nuclear scientific research center in Tuwait in the summer of 1981 (Iraq adheres to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty).

Finally, the developing countries are becoming increasingly aware that a continuing arms race makes problematical their acquisition of economic aid from the powers that are the most economically developed.

All the above leads us to the conclusion that if it is unleashed by the U.S. military-industrial complex or occurs as the result of unforeseen circumstances, the baneful consequences of nuclear war will completely overwhelm the developing countries also. This is why the policy and philosophy of confrontation are just as dangerous for them as for the Europeans and Americans.

Our Earth is only a diminutive planet in a silent, infinite universe. Similarly, we are the only intelligent civilization within the frontiers that the human intellect is able to encompass. Is it really possible to conduct an experiment with planet Earth in the spirit of "things more important than peace."? Is it permissible at all to think of categories in a philosophy of "crusades" against socialism and declare that militarism is a military power that can be put into motion with all its consequences, and use this as a basis for mutual relations between states? It is absolutely impermissible. And the land of the Soviets and the Soviet people shout this aloud.

"If it were possible to lower the level of arms and military expenditures on both sides and set about the disarmament for which we are actively striving," CPSU Central Committee general secretary Yu.V. Andropov stated at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum, "this would be a great blessing for all countries and peoples."* Nuclear disarmament is the only way in which the states and the peoples will be able to find real security.

* "Materials of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum of 14-15 June 1983."
Moscow, 1983, p 25.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Novaya i noveyshaya istoriya", 1983

9642
CSO: 1800/201

INTERNATIONAL

ROLE OF MARXISM IN NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS ASSESSED

Moscow NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 83
(signed to press 9 Nov 83) pp 12-24

[Article by R.A. Ul'yanovskiy: "The Legacy of Karl Marx and Today's National-Liberation Movement"]

[Text] The ideological legacy of Karl Marx is inexhaustible and at the same time profoundly contemporary. No single teaching has produced such a revolutionary turnaround in philosophical, economic and social political thought as has scientific socialism. No single teaching has become such a powerful means of social transformation or moved so confidently and boldly out of the world of ideas and into the world of revolutionary practice.

The century that separates us from the death of Karl Marx has been an age of a triumphant procession of his ideas throughout the world. Marxism-Leninism has become a powerful ideological and political force not only in Europe and North America but also in Asia, Africa and Latin America, that is, everywhere where the oppressed classes and peoples are waging a struggle in the name of social justice. The founders of scientific socialism could only dream of such a broad recognition of their ideas. Marxism-Leninism is now embodied in the world socialist system and in the international communist and workers' movement, and many of those participating in the democratic movement in all countries and continents are drawn to it.

It was emphasized at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum that the CPSU attaches paramount significance to the study of the legacies of K. Marx, F. Engels and V.I. Lenin. It is noted in the CPSU Central Committee plenum decree "Urgent Questions of Ideological and Mass Political Work by the Party" of 15 June 1983 how important the problem is of the need to achieve a profound understanding of the revolutionary teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin by the workers, for this teaching provides the key to the comprehension and resolution of the very complex problems of social development.

Speaking at the plenum, the CPSU Central Committee general secretary Yu.V. Andropov named as one of the radical features of today's world "the growing role of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America that have liberated themselves from colonial or semicolonial dependence. The processes taking place in them are complex and ambiguous and it is important to understand them correctly." [1]

The very rich ideological legacy of Marx offers an unfailing landmark in the study of these processes.

During the time of K. Marx the colonial East, submissive to the capitalist West, was slumbering. The final embers of resistance on a feudal and tribal basis were dying away and it seemed that the East had nothing to contribute to the revolutionary situation taking shape in Europe. The colonial empires were gaining strength and nothing yet presaged the "awakening of Asia" and the return of the peoples of the East to the world arena as independent subjects in historical development. Marx, however, was possessed of a global vision of social evolution and he discerned the interconnections and mutual influences that were beyond the reach of most of his contemporaries but that were to appear as an important factor in the historical process only in a later age. Even as long ago as the middle of the last century, when the formation of the colonial empires was not yet complete (for, of course, Marx did not live to see the complete carving up of Africa by the imperialist powers) he raised the problem of colonialism and its future, revealed its organic oneness with the destinies of capitalism, and linked the prospect of socialist revolution in Europe with the problem of the choice made by the peoples of the East on the path of development under conditions of independence. The subsequent history of the colonial East in its interrelationships with the West coincides in the main with the propositions put forward by K. Marx and F. Engels in their analysis of the causes and consequences of colonial wars and liberation movements in their time.

K. Marx showed that colonial usurpation is organically inherent in the capitalist method of production. He revealed the fundamental differences between colonial expansion and the imperial conquests of ancient times and the Middle Ages, and the colonial policy that had insured the industrial revolution in the countries of Europe and in the United States and the consolidation of industrial capitalism, and that had itself initially been stimulated by trade and subsequently industrial and finally financial capital striving to seize the entire world. Using voluminous historical material, Marx showed that the first capitalist accumulation took place in the industrial countries of Europe not only through the proletarianization of their own populations but also through the most barbaric and ruthless spoliation of the colonial peoples, accomplished at first by armed detachments, merchants and missionaries, and later also by the European manufacturers and capitalist enterprises that insured the intrusion of cheap factory-made goods and the exploitation of the colonies' human and natural resources.

In *Das Kapital*, K. Marx not only gave an account of the history of colonial predation but also revealed the fundamentally new factors to which capitalism's colonial expansion had led as it established the internationalization of economic links. It was linked economically with most countries in the world and at the same time it clearly and sharply divided the world into a small group of developed capitalist states--the conquerors and enslavers--and an enormous number of subjugated and ruthlessly exploited peoples whose wealth and labor became a most important stimulus in the accelerated development of industrial capitalism in Europe and North America. Thus, in an era when capitalism's colonial system was being forged, K. Marx revealed the contradiction which

in the age of imperialism was to be utterly condemned and become one of the main driving factors of social development.

K. Marx repeatedly emphasized the incalculable calamities brought down on mankind, the proletariat and peasantry of Europe, and the peoples of the colonial countries by the rapid growth of capitalist production. The historically progressive process of the formation of a world capitalist economy was accompanied by the cruel destruction of the traditional precapitalist, natural, patriarchal-feudal or family-tribal economic order and social structures, doomed with the arrival of the colonialists to a gradual demise. The destruction of home industries and handicrafts and of established economic links forced hundreds of millions of people into unbearable conditions of existence and was the greatest crime of world capitalism against the peoples of the colonies.

The words of K. Marx in his article "Future Results of British Dominion in India," uttered in connection with the great Sepoy Mutiny in the mid-19th century, apply equally to the economic consequences of the colonial usurpations and the ruthless forms of armed suppression of protests by the popular masses: "the profound hypocrisy and barbarity inherent in bourgeois civilization stares us in the face in naked form when we observe this civilization not at home, where it undertakes respectable reforms, but in the colonies, where it acts without any kind of cover." [2] As a result of the colonial conquest the countries of the East were doomed to the prolonged and agonizing adaptation of their economies to the world capitalist market. Their development was subordinated to foreign interests. Their blood was transfused into the veins of world capitalism.

Karl Marx, however, while taking fully into account the tragic forms that the course of the historical process has so often taken and continues to take, was not a pessimist, particularly with respect to long-term colonialism. He emphasized that against its own will colonialism was objectively preparing in the subjugated countries the material, social and political prerequisites for its own demise, just as capitalism was doing in the mother countries. In this sense the colonialists were acting as involuntary bearers of the elements of technical and cultural progress, even though they propagated them exclusively in the interests of the most efficient exploitation of seized territories and subjugated peoples.

Assessing the consequences of British dominion in India, K. Marx gave a definition of colonialism's historical role in general: "England," he wrote, "has to carry out a twofold mission in India, destructive and creative: on the one hand it must destroy the old Asiatic society and on the other it must lay the material foundation of Western society in Asia." [3] Laying the material foundations of Western, capitalist society was in a number of Asian countries a radical shift capable of again injecting into the local society the dynamism that had been lost during the course of enslavement, and of preparing the ground for switching the liberation movement from acts of the patriarchal-tribal or feudal ilk, which were doomed to failure, to a modern, antiimperialist nationalism that ultimately also led most colonial countries, in alliance with world socialism, to state independence.

When talking about the "creative mission" of British dominion in India, K. Marx had in mind exactly that the emergence of the shoots of Western, capitalist society would create the conditions essential for the struggle against colonialism. However, he was always able to draw the line between the side effects and the involuntary results of colonialism, or, more accurately, the influence of European equipment and culture penetrating into the East, and self-seeking colonial policy. In the final analysis the introduction of Western scientific knowledge and equipment into archaic Asiatic and African society exerted a positive effect on intellectual, social and economic life in the countries of the East. But mankind will never forget the shameful colonial domination by the European usurpers and the American slave traders and racists, which lasted 100-150 years, and in some cases 500 years, and cost the lives of hundreds of millions of people and buried the great civilizations of the subjugated peoples; and for this it will not forgive capitalism and imperialism.

K. Marx' position on this question differs fundamentally from the positions of those contemporary national-reformist leaders who have been too quick to forget the slavery and oppression and the burden and sacrifices in the struggle for independence, and ready to repeat in modified form the imperialist thesis about the civilizing mission of colonialism and even assert, as for example H. Bourgiba, L. Senghor and other figures in African national-reformism, that in the historical balance colonialism is positive and that it is revolution that, like any revolution, destroys in order to reconstruct. [4] An earthquake or a fire in a large city leads to a construction boom and renewal, but it is hardly cause to declare, like Griboyedov's Skalozub [a character who smiles too much and pretends that things are not as bad as they are--ed], that they are instruments of progress or a means of adornment.

K. Marx divorced technical and cultural progress from colonial policy, which brought nothing but calamity to the oppressed peoples. "The pages of the history of dominion by the British in India speak of almost nothing but destruction," he wrote. "Their creative work is barely discernible behind the heaps of ruins. Nevertheless, this work was started." [5] Moreover, K. Marx stressed that while colonialism exists the results of this "creative work" will remain inaccessible to the subjugated peoples: "The population of India will be unable to reap the ripe fruit of those elements of the new society that the British bourgeoisie sowed among them until in Great Britain itself the present ruling classes are squeezed out by the industrial proletariat or until the Indians themselves become strong enough to throw off the British yoke forever." [6]

The assessment made by K. Marx of the historical role of colonialism remains correct to this day, even though in its classical forms colonialism existed for almost an entire century after the death of K. Marx, and neocolonialism now also exists. This assessment can and should be enriched by analysis of the new forms and phenomena of colonial exploitation that have taken shape during the age of imperialism and following the collapse of the colonial system, but fundamentally it has not changed. And today the judgements of representatives of the communist and workers' movement about colonialism are based on the classic propositions of K. Marx, and it is to him that those fighting most persistently for national liberation turn.

While noting the emergence of the rudiments of the material base for Western, that is, capitalist, society in Asia, at the same time K. Marx proceeded from the premise that even if socialist revolution in Europe were to be delayed, world capitalism would still be unable to transform the colonial East into a capitalist edifice.

Two circumstances corroborate this extraordinarily important and prophetic conclusion of K. Marx. First of all, the short duration of capitalism. The reshaping of Asia and Africa on a capitalist basis, given the limited nature of the domestic market and the weakness of local capital, would require a prolonged period of time, and in the opinion of K. Marx, it did not have this time even then, in the middle of the last century.

It is not, however, only the time factor but all the relationships established between the colonies and the mother country that hampered the free development of capitalism. Development of the colonies was subordinated to the requirements of the mother country and the colonies became the victims of pillage and economic and political vassalage. The establishment of independent national capital contradicted the interests of the European powers, for colonial exploitation demanded socioeconomic vassalage and fed on it. Foreign capitalism deliberately not only preserved but also often propagated precapitalist systems at the colonial periphery. In all its internal policy colonialism relied on social reaction. This brought in high profits but at the same time undermined any opportunity for a normal capitalist transformation of the East. No rejuvenation of capitalism or flow of fresh new forces through recruitment of the countries of the East into capitalist production occurred. This shows not the shortsightedness of the strategists of colonialism but the actual and ineluctable historical contradictions drawing capitalism to its demise.

The age of imperialism with its characteristic export of capital, that is, transplanting capitalist production to the colonies, did not offer capitalism any basically new opportunities. Expansion of capitalist production in order to export superprofits from the colonies to the mother country again hampered the free development of local capitalism.

K. Marx lived only during the early period of the age of imperialism, when its distinguishing features had not yet been clearly delineated. Solving the enormous task of scientifically analyzing the new phenomena of world development on a Marxist basis fell to V.I. Lenin. But the essence of the relationships of dominion and subjugation between the mother countries and the colonies remained the same. K. Marx could not foresee contemporary neocolonialism and its inherent methods of imperialist exploitation, in particular through the multinational corporations. But even today, under conditions where classical colonialism is a thing of the past, the antagonism between developed European-American and Japanese capitalism and the former colonies remains.

Now, when the socialist revolution that K. Marx could only think about has become in some cases a reality and in others a real threat to capitalism both in the West and the East, imperialist forces have been made to adapt their strategy to the new conditions. Now it is not so much the saving of colonialism

in its new guise as the saving of capitalism itself that is being moved to the forefront. Imperialism is now proceeding toward an intensive transplantation of private capitalist production in the former colonies and toward agreement with local capitalists in which it tries to find a social buttress. But this course is being pursued within the framework of imperialist, that is, neocolonialist, policies, within the framework of the unequal and one-sided profitable economic links established between the former colonies and the former mother countries. Hence also the deformed, one-sided and quite often helpless appearance of Afro-Asian capitalism. Hence its weakness and its desire to attract foreign monopolies and cooperate with them in finding for itself not so much a production as a middleman field in the services sphere, and "neocompradorism."

It is in the continuing exploitation of former colonies by the imperialist powers that the main cause should be sought for the fact that in no country of the East which has thrown off the colonial yoke has capitalism been able to equal the monopolies of the former mother countries and compete successfully against them. Of all the countries of the East only in Japan has this happened, and it is only Japan that has reached the stage of imperialism and is actively intruding into world economic relations, trying to influence them in accordance with its own interests. But Japan was never a colony.

Even if they maintained some semblance of independence, the countries that experienced colonial oppression are in no condition to copy the example of Japan. Neither India, nor Thailand, nor Indonesia nor Saudi Arabia, in which the level of capitalism has increased or which have at their disposal enormous financial resources thanks to the oil boom, are able to do this. The kind of exacerbation of internal contradictions and the kind of flare-up of popular hatred that occurred when the Shah's regime in Iran tried to achieve a capitalist modernization with the support of U.S. imperialism are well known. With the exception of countries with a socialist orientation, all former colonial countries still find themselves in grip of capitalism's world economic system, which was not created for them nor in their interests. This system restrains the normal, free development of the former colonial periphery even along capitalist paths. The outflow of capital from former colonial countries into the countries of imperialism is still many times greater than the inflow. Spoliation of the liberated countries in the old forms and in various other forms, particularly neocolonialist forms, continues.

As for capitalism in the last century, which hampered the development of national capital, for modern capitalism there is no other choice. Its fate is bound up with neocolonial exploitation. Without the raw material base available in the former colonies, a base which is exploited on "favorable," that is, extortionate, terms thanks to the machinations of the world capitalist market, it will experience major difficulties. But along with retention of this exploitation, the contradiction between imperialism and national capitalism is also retained, similar to that which existed between the mother countries and the colonies in K. Marx' time, in an age of free competition. The existence of this contradiction shows that world capitalism sets itself in opposition not only to the forces of socialism but also to the forces of national liberation, which by the logic of history are destined to make alliances one with the other.

K. Marx' greatest historical service is that he not only revealed the exploiter nature of colonialism but also foresaw the way in which it would be liquidated. K. Marx regarded this problem as being linked with the upcoming socialist revolution and this enabled him to map out the truly internationalist cooperation between those fighting for socialism and those fighting for national self-determination.

K. Marx and F. Engels attentively followed all the liberation movements of the peoples of the East in their time--the Taiping Rebellion in China, the Sepoy Mutiny in India, and the anticolonial actions in Algeria, Egypt, Burma and Indonesia. The founders of scientific socialism regarded popular resistance to colonialism with a profound sympathy and they understood its governing principles, hailing the courage of fighters reduced to despair and bravely resorting to armed actions against the punitive armies. They noted many times that, as a rule, the anticolonial actions of that time took place under the leadership of the feudal aristocracy or the family-tribal leaders. But neither K. Marx nor F. Engels criticized the final flare-ups of "feudal nationalism" for their social and ideological limitations or their calls to maintain archaic relationships that were already doomed by the penetration of capitalism. K. Marx and F. Engels saw behind the narrowness of the feudal leadership the popular masses, rising up against the dominion of foreigners, and all their sympathies were with the oppressed, even though they understood the futility of a "feudal nationalism" that had no future and was unable to hold out in the struggle against colonial capitalism.

And K. Marx and F. Engels proposed two possibilities for liquidating colonialism in the East: the victory of socialist revolution in the mother countries or the victory of a truly national movement in the colonies, or both together. This is clear from a letter sent to K. Kautsky by F. Engels (1882) in which Engels said: "India, perhaps, will make revolution; it is even extremely probable." [7]

Under conditions in which the nationalism of colonial peoples was still being painted in the feudal colors, while the contemporary forces of resistance born not out of dying but out of emerging social relationships had not yet been established, and in which at the same time revolutionary situations were still periodically taking shape in Europe, a revolution in Europe seemed to K. Marx the more realistic way of liberating the colonies. However, the triumphant socialist revolution in Europe was not as close as it seemed to K. Marx. V.I. Lenin wrote of Marx, who lived through the defeat of the 1848 revolution: "His socialist illusions about a close socialist revolution in 1848 he himself abandoned in 1850." [8]

Nevertheless, K. Marx' thesis about the influence of socialist revolution on liberation from the colonial yoke not only retained its basic correctness but was also confirmed by the subsequent course of history. The colonial peoples of tsarist Russia were emancipated as the result of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The victory of the Great October and the formation of the world's first socialist state, and the challenges it threw down to the policy of imperialism, and its solidarity with oppressed peoples constituted a powerful stimulus for the development of the anticolonial movement. The

USSR, and, following the rout of German fascism and Japanese imperialism in World War II, the world socialist system, became a most important factor that insured success in the struggle by oppressed peoples and marked a turning point in the course of the anticolonial struggle, and during the period of the Forties through the Seventies led to the complete disintegration of imperialism's colonial system.

True, the experience of direct liberation of oppressed peoples as the result of the victory of socialism following the revolution in Russia was nowhere repeated. The chief way in which the colonial peoples moved to national self-determination was their own struggle, including armed methods. There is no doubt that this struggle would not have been so successful and that imperialism would have found ways to suppress it if there had been no political, moral, economic and military aid from the countries of socialism. Herein lies the brilliant confirmation of another genial foresight of K. Marx--that on the coincidence of the interests of those fighting for socialism in the industrial countries and those fighting for the national independence of the colonies, and on the historical inevitability of and need for their joint actions.

K. Marx was not simply an observer and profound investigator of the first mass anticolonial actions. He was the first proletarian revolutionary-internationalist to proclaim the slogan of support for the struggle of oppressed peoples and actively to pursue an anticolonial policy in the international workers' movement. The basis of this policy was the profoundly internationalist principle precisely formulated subsequently in the address of the General Council of the First International: "A people that enslaves another people is forging chains for itself." [9]

Oppression in the colonies exerts a baneful influence on the sociopolitical life of the mother country and corrupts even the working classes and diverts them from the struggle for their rights by kindling imperial and chauvinist attitudes. On the other hand, awakening the spirit of protest in the colonies exacerbates the social and political contradictions in the industrial countries and promotes the development of the revolutionary process. This was K. Marx' approach to the colonial problem, not only in its specific, European aspect but also in its typical Asiatic aspect. K. Marx had a sufficiently concrete idea of the effect on Europe of the major anticolonial uprisings in India, China and Egypt. "It will be a curious sight," K. Marx wrote in connection with the Taiping Rebellion, "when China rocks the Western world while at the same time the Western powers with the aid of British, French and American warships are establishing 'order' in Shanghai, Nanking and the estuary of the Grand Canal." [10]

The mass popular uprisings in the colonies in the 19th century failed to acquire the necessary scope and did not triumph but were repressed. But the correctness of the organic link between the two revolutionary movements, given all the differences in the social tasks, remains a solid achievement of scientific socialism.

Using the materials of his own time, which, it would seem, provided little basis for his conclusion, K. Marx was the first to raise the problem of combining proletarian revolution in the West with the national-revolutionary

movements and wars in the East. When V.I. Lenin proclaimed the slogan of uniting the revolutionary proletariat in the West with oppressed peoples throughout the world, he was developing a tradition established by K. Marx and F. Engels, and he raised this problem to the level of the tasks of the age of imperialism and the awakening of the colonial countries and provided a solution, adequate for his time, which became a source of strength for the world revolutionary antiimperialist movement.

In our time all the forces of reaction have taken up arms against the slogan of the unity of national liberation and socialism, seeing in it a threat to their own privileges. The frenzied anticomunist and anti-Soviet campaign unleashed by international imperialism, using any kind of slander and fabrications, in which the present U.S. administration is particularly zealous, has as one of its strategic goals confounding the rapprochement between the states of the socialist community and the developing countries.

Fearing the spreading influence of scientific socialism, local social reaction in the countries of the East is turning to anticomunism. The Afro-Asian national-bourgeois reformists, apprehensive that alliance with the socialist countries and the international communist movement would, as it were, undermine the positions of capitalism in their countries, also sometimes do this.

In the democratic circles of both the West and the East there is frequent failure to understand the need for the unity of the main revolutionary currents of the age. How else can we interpret the concept of "equal distance from the blocs" disseminated by some figures in the nonaligned movement? Or the idea that the revolutionariness of the working class in the West is allegedly extinguished and that the only source of revolutionary storm is now the so-called "third world,"--an idea that many have tried and are still trying to introduce into the medium of those fighting for freedom and independence in the countries of Asia and Africa (in particular the "new left" followers of Fanon [11]), and which is used by all those who would like to smash the alliance between the national-liberation movement and the countries of socialism and the truly revolutionary forces in the capitalist states?

Life itself refutes the attempts to isolate the now awakened East from the revolutionary movement in the West. Marxian foresight on the connection between revolution in the West and the East has been fully confirmed by the examples of recent history.

The victory of the antihitlerite coalition over fascism, with the decisive role of the Soviet Union, the antifascist war of national liberation in the countries of Europe, the formation of the socialist states in east and southeast Europe, and the victorious wars of national liberation against imperialist oppression in China, Vietnam, Indonesia, Laos, Kampuchea, Algeria and a number of other countries--are these not confirmation of the prevision concerning the unison of socialist revolution and the liberation struggle in Europe and the national-revolutionary war of the colonial peoples? The synchronism of these processes is obvious even though it occurred at a different time than Marx suggested. This synchronism is 100 years "late," the result of capitalism's transition to its imperialist stage, which also took about a century.

And the example of the revolutionary movement in Portugal and its colonies is typical! The Portuguese communists were the first to demand complete independence for the peoples of the Portuguese colonial empire and the liquidation of this empire. This slogan was taken up by the patriots in the Portuguese colonies, who in the Sixties entered into an heroic armed struggle that grew into a true war of national liberation. The crisis in the colonies became one of the most important reasons for the collapse of the fascist regime in Portugal and the victory of the democratic revolution in April 1974, which in turn made possible the very rapid triumphant conclusion of the liberation struggle by the peoples of Guinea-Bissau, the Cape Verde Islands, Angola and Mozambique. This was yet another confirmation of the Marxist-Leninist position on the fundamentally common nature of the interests of the struggle for democracy and progress in the West and in the East.

More than 100 years ago, even before the advent of the age of imperialism, K. Marx asserted that world capitalism would not have adequate time to transform the societies of the East to its own liking. This conclusion was based on an analysis of the interrelationships between capitalism and the precapitalist societies.

Capitalism was spread throughout the world and it acquired a truly worldwide character. But the expansion of Western capital required the preservation of social backwardness in the East. Capitalism needed precapitalist colonies, and capitalism's world economic system was a symbiosis of technical, economic and social progress and the feudal and semifeudal backwardness of the East, and the preservation and cultivation of archaism in the East was in a certain sense a condition of capitalism's progress at its centers. Stagnation in the colonies, accompanied by their pillage, was a major source of economic growth in the mother countries.

Hence arose the problem of the fate of precapitalist relationships, in particular in the colonial world where they prevailed under conditions of the dominance of the world capitalist market. K. Marx' greatest scientific feat was the discovery of the economic laws of capitalist formation, first and foremost the law on production and the appropriation of surplus value. This forms the basis of his theory on socialist revolution. But he did not limit his view to the capitalist method of production, for he realized that capitalism does not develop in a vacuum, under laboratory conditions, but in complete contradiction to reality. Having discovered the laws of capitalist development, K. Marx found that "categories expressing its relationships and an understanding of its organization together provide an opportunity for investigating the organization and production relationships of all obsolete social forms." [12] He turned to the study of these "obsoletes" from the viewpoint of the historical prospects of relationships in the East and a determination of their place in the development of all mankind, taking into account the world capitalist market, which was already formed; and he concluded that in an era of socialist revolutions in the advanced countries of Europe, the economic determinism that had doomed the old social structures to a long-drawn-out and painful destruction under the influence of capitalism could be and would be broken by socialist revolution in the most advanced countries

in such a way that, given favorable conditions, the collectivist tendencies inherent in these structures could serve as a base for the transition to socialism, bypassing and avoiding capitalism or shortening its developmental phase.

As long ago as the 1850's K. Marx and F. Engels predicted the possibility of bypassing the "capitalist Calvary," that is, the possibility of a noncapitalist path of development to socialism, for peoples that preserved their community traditions. In the words of K. Marx, after a socialist revolution "takes possession of the achievements of the bourgeois era, a world market, and modern production forces and subordinates them to the general control of the most advanced peoples" the passage of all peoples through the stage of capitalism should lose its character of historical inevitability. Capitalism would no longer be able to act as the sole form of social development, and, as K. Marx said in this connection, progress "will no longer be satisfied with this loathsome heathen idol that would drink nectar only from the skulls of dead people." [13]

The problem of bypassing capitalism acquired special urgency for K. Marx and F. Engels in connection with the revolutionary situation in Russia. In the preface to the second Russian edition of "The Communist Party Manifesto" (1882) they wrote: "If the Russian revolution serves as a signal for proletarian revolution in the West, so that they complement each other, the present Russian community ownership of land may be the initial point for communist development." [14]

But this possibility was definitely not applied by the founders of scientific socialism only to Russia. In the epilogue to the work "On the Social Question in Russia" F. Engels clearly formulated a general principle: "There is no doubt that after the victory of the proletariat and the transfer of the means of production to common ownership among the West European peoples, those countries that have only just started out on the path of capitalist production and in which family customs or vestiges of family customs have survived" will have the opportunity "to considerably cut short the process of their own development toward a socialist society... And this applies not only to Russia but also to all countries that are in the precapitalist stage of development." [15]

Analysis of historical reality in all its diversity, and consideration of the relationships in the stages of development and the various social formations and their conflict and mutual relations led K. Marx and F. Engels to the conclusion about "a foreshortened process of development" and the transition of backward peoples to socialism, bypassing capitalism, given the condition of victory for the socialist revolution in the main centers of world capitalism.

Guided by these methodological principles V.I. Lenin enriched the concept of noncapitalist development, that is, development of socialism "not via capitalism," as applicable in the age of imperialism. Like K. Marx and F. Engels, he proceeded here not from abstract schemes or naive ideas about "chemically pure" methods of production but from a consideration of multiple-plane, extremely inhomogeneous and contradictory world reality that combines different historical social formations in a single chronological segment.

Since the end of the last century world capitalism has developed in forms that K. Marx was unable to foresee. He did not witness capitalism's transition into imperialism and the formation of gigantic monopolies, and in our time, the multinational corporations. V.I. Lenin provided a brilliant analysis of the monopoly stage of imperialism but, struggling against the primitive, schematic understanding of financial capital, he repeatedly stressed that there could be no pure imperialism, superimperialism or the formation of a unified world trust. This would simplify the task of socialist revolution extraordinarily. "Then," V.I. Lenin said at the 8th Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Congress, "all that would be needed would be to remove the leadership and transfer everything else into the hands of the proletariat." But this is not the reality, because "imperialism is a superstructure above capitalism." [16] This actual reality, filled with contradictions, dictated more complex and diverse paths to the development of revolution.

Logically, imperialism cannot resolve its own contradictions by moving on to the formation of a worldwide trust. But this means that there is an extraordinary exacerbation and congeries of social and economic conflicts born not only out of the inherent stage of monopoly capital but also its combination with free competition and the precapitalist stages of production. Imperialism has inherited the whole tangle of contradictions inherent in premonopoly capitalism and exacerbated it to the limit.

The concentration of capital sets a small handful of monopolists against an enormous army of hired labor. Under the conditions of unequally developed capitalism, the conflicts between the monopolies acquire particularly dramatic forms and grow into real economic warfare. The crisis phenomena in the economy are increasing. Unemployment has never reached such a level. The economic oppression of the countries that have liberated themselves from colonialism has become a truly global problem, while the struggle against neocolonialism is one of the most important factors undermining the capitalist system. And all these processes are taking place under conditions of the victory of socialism over a considerable part of the world and under conditions of the great opposition between socialism and capitalism that is determining the course of world history.

Imperialism, which has set itself in opposition to the hopes of all mankind, and to peace and progress, is sustaining one blow after another, not only at its periphery but even in West Europe. The democratic revolution in Portugal, the fall of fascism in Spain, the overthrow of the reactionary dictatorship of the "black colonels" in Greece, and the accession to power of leftist governments in a number of countries are all real successes of the revolutionary process in the centers of bourgeois civilization and proof of the obvious shift to the left among the popular masses.

The age of socialist revolutions and national-liberation revolutions--an age of the general crisis of capitalism--is, as it were, shortening the time frame, cutting short the stage of social progress, and accelerating the historical process. At the present stage the transition from awakening to the struggle for freedom, from national democracy to socialism, is being accomplished more rapidly than in the time of K. Marx. The popular,

democratic and antiimperialist movements in the West and in the East are detecting a distinct trend toward transition to the stage of social transformations and revolutions. It occurred in central and southeast Europe, where socialist revolution grew out of the armed popular struggle against fascism. It occurred a decade and a half later in Cuba. It occurred in Vietnam, then Laos, Kampuchea and a number of other countries where the people gained victory in the struggle against the colonialists.

The noncapitalist development of a number of countries in the East is a unique version of a solution to what is fundamentally the same problem of preparing the conditions for socialist revolution. It has been born out of the entire aggregate of the realities of today's world--imperialist exploitation, competition between the two systems, help from the countries of the socialist community, the underdevelopment of capitalism in most former colonial countries. It long ago ceased to be merely a theoretical hypothesis. The bold conclusion of K. Marx and F. Engels, taken up and developed by V.I. Lenin under the new conditions, was confirmed in practice by the outlying regions of former tsarist Russia, Mongolia and other Asiatic countries. This idea has been embodied in the powerful movement of the politically advanced forces in Asia and Africa. The number of countries setting out on a path of socialist orientation is growing, while the social, ideological and political platform of the vanguard parties is increasingly approximating scientific socialism.

The communist movement has been gaining ground since the Twenties in the then colonial East. Under extraordinarily difficult conditions it has been gathering strength and becoming an important factor in the sociopolitical life of the countries of Asia and Africa. At the turn of the Fifties and Sixties it was stated at the 1960 International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties that a new stage is opening up in the democratic movement and that a modern Afro-Asian national revolutionary democracy is being formed, acting along a socialist orientation. [17] It has become an important source for the spread of the ideas of scientific socialism among oppressed peoples, and some of its representatives have boldly and confidently moved on to the position of scientific socialism.

The socialist orientation is the most promising, but not the only path for development for the countries of Asia and Africa. Capitalism is being developed in most of them. In many countries a realistic consideration of the sociopolitical situation dictates the need to struggle for democracy and antiimperialism under the conditions of capitalist development. In the final analysis a choice between capitalism and socialism is inevitable, and truly socialist forces are always guided by this; but the day-to-day political struggle often dictates more flexible criteria of behavior.

The problem of antiimperialist struggle, and especially the antiwar struggle on a nationwide basis, and the problem of democratic transformations and democratic revolution retain their exceptional importance.

It was emphasized at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum that the objective interests of those liberated countries in which the capitalist order has been asserted "are contradicted by the aggressive policy of domination and diktat being pursued by the imperialist powers. As they strive to overcome

economic backwardness, these countries need equitable international cooperation and a stable world. Many of them see in links with the socialist countries a means of strengthening their own independence. Naturally, henceforth we shall pursue a course aimed at mutually advantageous cooperation with these states, with complete respect for sovereignty and nonintervention in their affairs." [18]

Karl Marx had no knowledge of the enormously significant historical events of the last century. He could not personally think about and generalize them. But everything that he wrote about the prospects for the development of capitalism, whose general principles he revealed, shows that he attached enormous importance to the unity of the struggle by the international proletariat and the oppressed peoples of the colonies against the dominance of capital and against war, which is organically inherent in capitalism and is very often directed against the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In recent years highly placed figures in the U.S. administration have been publicly propagandizing the dangerous concepts of "limited" and likewise "protracted" nuclear war, and the purport of these concepts is to force the peoples to accustom themselves to the idea of the permissibility of thermonuclear conflict. A desire to smash the edifice of international detente built up in the peace policy of the Seventies through the efforts of peace-loving forces, and in particular the Soviet Union and all the socialist states, the unbridled but unrealizable desire to give to itself the role of master of the fate of the world, and attempts to prevent at any cost any further weakening of the positions of imperialism following the powerful flight of the popular antiimperialist revolutions of the past decades--this is what distinguishes the present policy of the most aggressive U.S. circles and their closest allies.

In our time imperialism has set for itself an unattainable goal--halting the historically conditioned and law-governed processes that during the last two or three decades have brought about colossal changes in the world, expressed in particular in the liquidation of the world colonial system in its classic forms. In this relatively short time the system of oppression and enslavement of peoples, created by capitalism over the course of several centuries, has been destroyed. More than 100 new sovereign states have risen up on the ruins of the former colonial empires. The world community now numbers more than 160 independent states, and most of them are countries that have gained national independence as the result of the collapse of imperialism's colonial system.

The chief thing that dismays the aggressive imperialist circles in the acceleration that is now taking place in the world revolutionary process is the organic link between the liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the existence of the socialist system on our planet. On the one hand the national-liberation movement is learning about socialist and Marxist ideas that are new for it, and even specific forms and methods for the struggle for social progress, developed as a result of the transformations in the socialist countries. On the other hand, the liberation struggle of the peoples of the developing countries relies on growing support

and aid from the countries of the socialist communities. K. Marx foresaw these phenomena even though he did not specify their occurrence within historical time frames. All these processes are taking place within the channel of Marxism and they are in harmony with its spirit, its theoretical bases, and Marxist revolutionary dialectic.

Any truly democratic movement legitimately deserves the support of Marxist-Leninists. Sectarianism is alien to them; Marxist-Leninists see in the popular masses that have been aroused to defend their own rights an army of supporters in the struggle against imperialism. They strive for an equal and honorable alliance with all those fighting against war and for peace, justice and social progress, and against reaction and imperialism, and herein lies the guarantee for the further spread of the ideas of Karl Marx and their decisive contribution to the final revolutionary rebirth of the liberated countries.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Materials of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, 14-15 June 1983." Moscow 1983, p 23.
2. K. Marx and F. Engels. Works, Vol 9, p 229.
3. Ibid. p 225.
4. L'ACTION, Tunis, 2 Mar 66; L.S. Senghor. "Nation et Voie Africaine: du socialisme" [On African Socialism], Paris, 1964, p 118.
5. K. Marx and F. Engels. op. cit. Vol 9, p 225.
6. Ibid. pp 228-229.
7. Ibid. Vol 35, p 297.
8. V.I. Lenin. Complete Collected Works. Vol 14, p 374.
9. K. Marx and F. Engels. op. cit. Vol 16, p 438.
10. Ibid. Vol 9, p 103.
11. Frantz Fanon (1925-1961). An Algerian political figure, ideologist of the national-liberation movement, theoretician and active figure in the insurrection struggle against the colonialists.
12. K. Marx and F. Engels. op. cit. Vol 12, p 731 (from the written legacy of K. Marx).
13. Ibid. Vol 9, p 230.
14. Ibid. Vol 19, p 305.

15. Ibid. Vol 22, pp 445-446.

16. V.I. Lenin op. cit. Vol 38, p 155.

17. "Program Documents for the Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism."
Moscow, 1961, p 67.

18. "Materials of the CPSU" op. cit. p 23.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Novaya i noveshaya istoriya", 1983

9642

CSO: 1800/201

INTERNATIONAL

USA INSTITUTE OFFICIAL WRITES ON U.S. SPACE MILITARIZATION PLANS

Moscow VEK XX I MIR in Russian No 12, Dec 83 pp 19-23

[Article by Andrey Kokoshin, doctor of historical sciences: "Space is Not an Arena for Confrontation"; Boldface text enclosed in slantlines]

[Text] The editors have received a number of letters in which the readers ask for a description of the new American antimissile space defense system and what sort of threat it poses for strategic stability and international security.

Upon our request, Doctor of Historical Sciences Andrey Kokoshin, deputy chairman of the Committee of Soviet Scientists for the Defense of Peace and Against Nuclear War, chief of the Department for Military and Political Research at the Institute of the USA and Canada, USSR Academy of Sciences, has agreed to answer these questions.

Greeting the shuttle astronauts when they returned from the first flight, President Reagan announced that the USA will prepare for war in space. Next, in July 1982 there followed an official directive on the new policy for space exploration and utilization. The U.S. Department of Defense also received the appropriate orders. On 23 March 1983 Reagan called upon the Americans to create "defensive weapons" by the beginning of the 21st century, which would supposedly completely deliver them from the threat of nuclear war.

The question is supposedly one of creating a system of antimissile space defense [AMSD]. But no one should be misled by the word "defense", for Washington has in fact decided to try to achieve strategic superiority in "Star Wars" under the guise of a false declaration of a "Soviet military threat" from space. According to the outspoken statement of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Political Matters, R. Stivers, "The one who has the capability to control space will have the entire world in his gun-sights".

Judging by data published in the USA, the ultimate type of AMSD system has not yet been chosen, and several potential variants of it are in research and development. One of them is the "High Frontier" project.

Project "High Frontier" envisages creating a multi-layered "defense system". The first of these "layers" would consist of antimissile space defense equipped with missiles which must destroy the soviet missiles during the first part of their flight; the second "layer" consists of a more extensive space system which employs lasers and beam weapons, designed to destroy both ballistic missiles (in the upper layers of the atmosphere) aimed at ground targets in the USA, and missiles aimed at American space stations; the third "layer" consists of ground-based antimissile defense to protect American ICBM launch positions; the fourth "layer" is a "passive defense" system for civil defense.

One can surmise that creation of an antimissile space defense system has already begun. The Pentagon and its contractors, engaged in a crash program to create military space technology, are operating simultaneously in several directions. The Livermore Laboratory, for example, is developing X-ray lasers for single-shot operation, the "pumping" of which will be accomplished by a nuclear explosion. The primary "pusher" of this type weapon is one of the creators of the American hydrogen bomb, Edward Teller, who is well-known for his "hawkish" views.

Also being actively developed is a chemical laser which works on fluoride. The prototype of this laser has undergone testing on board a C-135 aircraft: the laser beam destroyed air-to-air missiles. In the more distant future, it is planned to create cluster weapons, which utilize clusters of elementary particles, both charged and neutral, with high energy concentration; also planned are systems which utilize microwaves or electromagnetic impulses. The systems which direct these currents are intended for knocking out ballistic missile warheads and guidance systems, and other means of destruction as well. In accordance with the plans of those who advocate creating a space missile defense system, hundreds of battle stations with one type of directed energy weapon or another, must be put into earth orbit.

In connection with this, an important role has been assigned to reusable space ships such as the "shuttle". A special military space port is being built at a rapid pace at Vandenberg Air Force Base.

Leading Soviet scientists, responding to the aforementioned speech by President Reagan, have addressed an open letter to all people of good will, and especially to scientists, in which they declare with all sincerity that in a nuclear war there are no effective defensive measures, and it is practically impossible to create them. And an attempt to create so-called "defensive weapons" against the strategic nuclear forces of the other side, of which the President of the USA spoke, inevitably takes the form of still another element which in fact increases the American "first strike" potential, on which the development of American strategic weaponry has been concentrated of late. Such "defensive weapons" can provide hardly anything to a country which has been subjected to a sudden massive attack, since they are not capable of defending the overwhelming majority of the populace. The use of antimissile weapons suits primarily the attacking side, as it strives to diminish the force of the answering strike. However, antimissile

weapons cannot completely prevent an answering strike either. Thus, the initiative of the President of the USA, who promises to create new antimissile weapons, is manifestly oriented toward destabilizing the existing strategic balance.

"It is clear that the Soviet Union will not permit the realization of this new threat. The USSR, and this is no secret, is in a completely different position than in the 1940's and 50's. It has both strategic, and I would say to a significant degree, technological parity with the United States. The USSR will do everything necessary to respond to this new challenge from the USA. But to be honest about it, this will not make it easier for anyone, inasmuch as the danger of war will increase even more," authoritatively stated Academician E. P. Velikhov, chairman of the Committee of Soviet Scientists for the Defense of Peace and Against Nuclear War. After all, the entire history of creating new weapons systems proves, that for every weapon a counterweapon is always found.

Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, in his interview with the newspaper PRAVDA, made the following statement with respect to Reagan's speech: "At first glance this might even seem attractive to uninformed people; after all, the President seems to be speaking about defensive measures. But this is only at first glance, and only to those who are not familiar with these questions. In fact, the strategic offensive forces of the USA will continue to be developed and improved at full speed, and in a very definite direction at that--toward acquiring the potential to deliver the first nuclear strike. In these conditions the intention to acquire the capability to destroy with its antimissile defense system the corresponding strategic means of the other side, that is to deprive it of the ability to deliver an answering strike, is designed to disarm the Soviet Union in the face of the American nuclear threat". Comrade Yu.V. Andropov further remarked that even at the beginning of the strategic arms limitation talks between the USSR and the USA, both sides jointly acknowledged that there is an indissoluble interrelation between strategic offensive and defensive weapons. On the strength of this, it was not by chance that the Treaty on Limitation of Antimissile Defense Systems and the first agreement on limiting strategic offensive weapons were concluded at the same time. "In other words," stressed Yu.V. Andropov, "the parties acknowledged and recorded in the specified documents that only mutual restraint in the area of antimissile defense would permit moving ahead on the way to limiting and reducing offensive weapons; that is, to restrain and to turn back the strategic arms race as a whole. But now the USA has made plans to disrupt this interrelation. The result of such a conception, should it be realized, would be to actually open the gates for an unrestrained race in all types of strategic weapons, both offensive and defensive. Such is the actual sense, so to speak, of the reverse side of the 'defensive conception' of Washington".

The administration's plans with respect to the large-scale space antimissile system has encountered sharp criticism from many American political and public figures, scientists and even retired military personnel. The struggle against creation of a large-scale space antimissile and anti-satellite system is becoming an important theme in the antinuclear movement in the USA.

In examining the international political aspects of creating a large-scale AMSD system, the critics of Reagan's proposals justly devote their attention primarily to the fact that by its policy the administration is bringing the matter to a breach of the indefinite Soviet-American Treaty on Antimissile Defense, which was concluded in 1972 and which remains the /only ratified and functioning agreement on limiting strategic weapons/, the value of which on the strength of this is especially great. Article V of this treaty forbids not only the deployment but also the testing of an AMSD system based in space.

Well-founded attention is being given to the fact that creating an anti-missile system which utilizes Earth satellite vehicles (along with the development of antisatellite weapons, which are being created at an accelerated pace in the USA) for all practical purposes places a barrier in the path to cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States on the peaceful use of space. A great number of American experts and political figures, in examining the possible consequences of creating a large-scale antimissile system in space, convincingly point out that, /from the point of view of strategic and military-political stability, and of maintaining equilibrium in the forces of the two sides, this will be an exceptionally dangerous step, which increases and does not at all decrease the threat of nuclear conflict/. One of these, S. Talbot, for example, writes that for many American experts the administration's efforts on creating space "defensive weapons" presents "the horror of a new and exceptionally destabilizing arms race". He delivers the well-founded warning that deploying strategic defensive weapons may serve as the beginning of a chain reaction with the most negative consequences. The Soviet Union will have every reason to suppose that the United States, in creating a large-scale AMSD system, intends primarily to provide for itself conditions in which it could avoid a destructive answering strike after the USA itself launches the first strike.

In the course of the debate which developed around the consequences of creating a space antimissile system, its opponents devoted well-founded attention to the fact that under certain conditions it is entirely possible to consider it not only a means of defense against ballistic missiles in the launch phase, and not only an antisatellite weapon, but also an offensive weapon against ground targets, and precisely for inflicting the first strike at that. As TIME magazine correctly noted, an AMSD system cannot be purely defensive.

No specialist who is the least bit serious has any doubts that creating a large-scale space antimissile system will involve expenses on a vast scale. Retired General Graham, the leading author of the "High Frontier" project, has named a sum of 40 billion dollars. This figure is so unrealistic, so tendentiously understated, that it doesn't deserve any serious comment. Closer to the truth, it would appear, is the well-known American specialist on strategic weapons systems from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Professor K. Tsipis, who estimates expenses for creating the chemical fuel alone (for the variant of an antimissile system which houses lasers on orbiting stations) at 100 billion dollars.

Materials from the Washington Center for Defense Information (quoting specialists from the Defense Department) point out that the cost of such a system would amount to hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars.

Certain American scientists characterized Reagan's space plan as, "Surpassing all bounds of scientific frivolity". In their opinion, developing such a system, aside from the colossal expense, would require not less than three decades.

It became clear as the debate developed that the overwhelming majority of American specialists have doubts over the very possibility of creating any sort of reliable defense of this type from a scientific and technological point of view. Analysis of the speeches of the American scientists on the given question indicates that only a small group of specialists is trying to vindicate the idea of such a system; these men have gathered around the "father of the hydrogen bomb", E. Teller and Science Advisor to President Reagan, George Keyworth (the latter, incidentally, came to the White House on the specific recommendation of E. Teller).

Quite a number of American scientists have convincingly revealed the destabilizing nature and the simultaneous scientific-technical groundlessness of the various variants of a large-scale space antimissile system and its basic components. These include such well-known representatives of American academic circles as Nobel Prize-winner S. Towns, one of the inventors of the laser; R. Garvin; P. Dotti; and Professors G. Beatty, F. Press, C. York and many others.

As G. Wisner, former science advisor to President Kennedy, noted: "It would be a miracle if we succeeded in creating such a system of missile defense, which could destroy 90-95 per cent of the missiles. But," he notes with irony, "the remaining 5-10 per cent would be sufficient to wipe civilization from the face of the Earth..."

In calling upon the country to mobilize all economic resources and scientific forces for the creation of a large-scale AMSD system, Reagan is appealing to the evident fear of the Americans of the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, the growth of which he, incidentally, so clearly abetted by his own aggressive and irresponsible foreign and domestic policies.

He is speculating on the poorly-informed state of the "average American", who has been fooled by the one-dimensional, stereotypical militaristic propaganda with respect to the realities of the strategic balance, and the dialectical ties between the means for defense and offense, between the two arms of the "balance beam" of equilibrium of both sides' military forces. A situation in which in the event nuclear war breaks out, practically every living thing on Earth will be annihilated is contrary to human nature; it weighs on the minds of billions of people, which includes political and military figures as well. Obviously we must be delivered from such a general "balance of terror", but this must be done in such a manner that neither strategic nor political and psychological destabilization may occur. This is possible only under conditions of significant improvement

in the entire complex of relations between the USSR and the USA, and between the NATO nations and the Warsaw Pact Organization, with mutual trust among the nations and their political leaders, and in an atmosphere which is free from political demagogic and artificially-created illusions. Taking the aforementioned material into consideration, the creation of a large-scale space antimissile system will turn out to be not a deliverance from the capability for "mutual assured destruction", not stabilization of the strategic balance and a reduction in the danger of a catastrophic nuclear war erupting, but will have exactly the opposite effects. Understanding all the dangers from spreading the arms race into space, recognizing the illusory hopes for creating an "absolutely reliable defense" from space, the Soviet leadership has brought forth great new initiatives in this area. "The Soviet Union," said Yu.V. Andropov on 18 August in conversations with American senators, "considers it necessary to come to an agreement on a total ban of testing and deploying any weapons based in space for destroying targets on the ground, in the air or in space". Displaying genuine realism in its approach to strategic stability and international security, the Soviet Union is prepared to resolve the question of these weapons in the most radical fashion--to agree to eliminate the already-existing anti-satellite systems and to ban the creation of new ones.

9006
CSO: 1807/90

INTERNATIONAL

WESTERN MEDIA COVERAGE OF SOVIET SPACE PROBLEMS, SHIPS STRANDED IN ARCTIC ASSAILED

Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 47, 22 Nov 83 pp 1-2

[Article by A. Trush: "The Soviet Character"]

[Text] For a long time they have spoken in the West of "the enigmatic Russian character," of its incomprehensibility and even... absurdity. At the same time as the moral-political and economic unity of the peoples of our country has grown stronger, the word "Russian" is being used increasingly frequently by bourgeois philosophers and politologists as a synonym for the word "Soviet." They thus willy-nilly acknowledge that we Soviet people, are bound not only by a community of aims in the building of a new, classless society but also have certain moral and spiritual qualities that have been developed over the years.

These qualities--and it is possible to include among them whole-hearted devotion to the Socialist Fatherland, the ideals of the revolution, deep faith in the rightness of our cause, labor enthusiasm, the feeling of collectivism and comradely mutual aid, the readiness to forgo one's interests and even to sacrifice oneself for the sake of others, for the sake of society--have been placed in the West in the rank of unfathomable features of the Russian character.

And they have been unable to understand them there because of class preconceptions. Nonetheless, this does not prevent the "sovietologists" in the service of capitalism, punctually carrying out the propaganda orders of their masters, from spreading the thesis of the allegedly existing "crisis of the Russian spirit."

As always, our enemies have assumed the path of hyperbolization and generalization of isolated, atypical cases and juggling of facts. In this connection, they count on the philistine, that is, on the one who lacks a social outlook and lives solely in his petty personal interests. Unfortunately, we have such people. And when they hear in "radio-voice" broadcasts that in the West they are shedding crocodile tears concerning "the crisis of the Russian spirit," then you see that they begin to take stock of life with an alien measure and to grieve that "the people are deteriorating."

But this is watered "soup" for the use of subversive radio centers, who in their attempts to discredit the Soviet system do not stop at anything. They deliberately distort events, overemphasize negative factors, and where such are not to be found--they fabricate them.

The following two cases can serve as a fairly convincing confirmation of this. They are connected with release in the press of the emergence into open space of the crew of our orbiting complex and what occurred in the eastern area of the Arctic where several tens of Soviet vessels were suddenly icebound together.

The bourgeois mass information media, including "radio voices," in describing what took place tried, on the one hand, to dramatize it and, on the other, to denigrate the greatness of the feat accomplished by our citizens. They said that very little depended on the people, it was all solved by use of equipment.

What was all this like in reality?

The Feeling of Comradeship... Above the Planet

Vladimir Lyakhov and Aleksandr Aleksandrov prepared for a long time for this most difficult operation unprecedented in the history of space navigation. They trained on Earth at the hydrobasin of the Center for Training of Cosmonauts. Here weightlessness was imitated and each movement was carefully worked out and for several months while in flight on the Salyut orbital station. But here work was conducted jointly with specialists from the Flight Control Center and testers of the hydrolaboratory, who repeatedly "played through" 48 standard and 189 nontypical situations.

The cosmonauts had to perform a difficult task: to connect to one of the solar batteries two additional panels after first setting and unfolding them. These had been brought to the orbit by the Kosmos-1443 spacecraft. This task was made extremely difficult by the fact that it had to be performed not on Earth but under the conditions of profound space vacuum, tremendous temperature differentials and a high level of radiation.

The installation of the panels was due to the necessity of boosting the capabilities of Salyut's power-supply system for expanded scientific-technical research and experiments. In addition, it was dictated by the fact that under the action of radiation, hits by micrometeorites and other factors the solar batteries with time operate with lower efficiency.

Incidentally, it is obvious that the work discussions with the cosmonauts on the special considerations of conducting the forthcoming installation operation were somehow incorrectly understood and interpreted in the United States... as a consequence of a breakdown on the orbital complex. The radio voices even accused Lyakhov and Aleksandrov of being "space hostages."

It is not difficult to guess why such a mistake took place: an extraordinary happening on our space complex would simply serve the desire to deflect public attention from recent American failures with the "Shuttle" and create concern among the Soviet people.

However, television reports from open space on the handling of the installation operations showed in the best possible way that everything was in order with respect to Lyakhov and Aleksandrov. But even if some unpredictable situation had occurred in orbit, then our cosmonauts, of this we are certain, would have done everything possible for a successful solution.

V. Lyakhov once proved this. At that time, in August 1979, they with V. Ryumin found it necessary to go out unexpectedly into open space for the purpose of releasing the tremendous antenna of the radio telescope which in firing had gotten caught in the equipment used in docking to help guide a spaceship to the station. The problem, despite its complexity, was handled brilliantly. They dealt with it successfully because they were thinking not only of their safety but also of seeing to it that the labor of the large collective of scientists, engineers, technicians and workers would not be lost. This was a demonstration of Soviet character.

It was displayed to perfection in a recent situation involving the installation of additional panels for the solar battery, making it possible to increase its capacity by 50 percent. In order to carry out all the prescribed operations, Lyakhov and Aleksandrov were obliged twice to leave the station and to spend a total of almost 6 hours outside it.

Six hours of most strenuous work and most attentive looking after each other. And every movement had to be precise, faultless. As one of the cosmonauts said --it is like putting a thread through the eye of a needle with boxing gloves on. If such is the case, Lyakhov and Aleksandrov succeeded in doing this time and again. They did not falter or give in because they believed in themselves, believed in their equipment, believed in the strong friendship of men and in their comrades, who were constantly monitoring and directing the flight from Earth, as well as duplicating on simulators its basic aspects and were always ready to come to their aid. Without this faith, courage and feeling of comradeship, the work entrusted to them could not have been accomplished. And here again the Soviet character was manifested.

When Even the Arctic Yields

In this example the last page was written only a few days ago when in the eastern section of the Arctic, an unprecedented duel of men and equipment with a desert of ice came to an end and when this year's navigation was completed there.

Difficulties began to be experienced by the sailors maintaining the supply of construction projects, cities and settlements of Eastern Siberia along the North Sea Route toward the end of September when heavy ice formed from the mouth of the Kolyma to Bering Strait. For the passage of vessels, a single, solitary passage remained, but after the direction of the wind had sharply changed on 5 October, it became covered over with Canadian pack ice--heavy perennial ice which had moved to the continent from polar areas.

This was observed for the first time in the last hundred years. It would have been practically impossible to deal with this ice even by our famed nuclear

powered vessels. Initially 90 transport vessels with important cargoes for Chukotka and Yakutia found themselves prisoners of the ice. By 7 October, 22 of the vessels succeeded in breaking out of the Arctic vise. The rest required an exhausting, many-day struggle, involving bringing together almost the entire icebreaking fleet.

Western "radio voices," reveling in sensation, did not fail to "whisper" concerning the reasons for the protracted navigation in the eastern part of the Arctic, although they "forget" to mention that they had retrieved the information from the newspaper PRAVDA of 20 October. Our "good wishers" also forgot to tell about the courage of Soviet people, who finally won out over the "elements," but then they did mention foodstuffs were being exhausted or already had been exhausted, that the motor ship NINA SAGAYDAK had been sunk, while KOLYA MYAGOTIN had been barely saved.

But nobody was hiding this. Gallant navigators consciously assumed risk, striving to carry out their duty and deliver to northerners construction materials, fuel, provisions and the like required for the long polar winter. Soviet people were doing what they could for the sake of Soviet people.

For 2 days the crew of the NINA SAGAYDAK struggled for the life of the motor ship. Squeezed by the ice, it was seriously damaged. In particular, the chief engine went out of order. But the deck crew and the engine division operated with precision and won the first engagement. Then drifting ice caused caused the tanker KAMANETS-URAL'SKIY to collide with the ship. On the NINA SAGAYDAK, they succeeded in lowering overboard motor-vehicle covers, logs, anything capable of softening the blow. Water was poured on the sides. This made it possible to avoid a fire, but the body of the tanker still ripped apart the plating of the motor vessel.

Thanks to the dedicated actions of the crew, it was possible to seal the hole and even to put the broken rudder back into operating condition. This was followed by one more collision with the tanker, with the ice it broke the bow bulkhead of the engine room, and a fire broke out.

And here the seamen rose to the occasion. Despite the fact that this was the first trip in the ice for many of them, no one lost his presence of mind, no one panicked. Only when all the pumps went out of order and it became dangerous to remain on the ship, the decision was made to evacuate. This was done in a well-coordinated manner without any commotion.

The sailors on the motor vessel KOLYA MYAGOTIN conducted life-saving operations just as manfully as on the NINA SAGAYDAK. After an almost 3-meter hole was closed up with the help of construction materials delivered by helicopters, they were able to bring it out of the ice.

The selfless struggle against the pressure of the ice went on on each ship. It brought out the best qualities of Soviet character. I probably would not be wrong in saying that these qualities were displayed by all the participants of the ice epic....

Soviet character.... It was born in the days of the October revolution, tempered in the crucible of class warfare. Each generation imparts to it new attractive features. Just try to describe their diversity! It involves the conscious fulfillment of the sacred duty of protecting the borders of our Motherland, the desire to be at the center of constructive work, to make oneself known by one's heroic labor, the desire, while not yielding to difficulties, to get to know the unknown, intolerance of those negative phenomena that one encounters, a critical attitude toward oneself and much more.

As for the assertions about a "crisis" of the Russian spirit, the Russian character, this is nothing else than cheap speculation in the heat of psychological war unleashed and conducted against the USSR and the other socialist countries by the United States and its stooges.

7697

CSO: 1807/62

INTERNATIONAL

ALGERIAN PROBLEMS: AGRICULTURE, HIGH BIRTH RATE, PRIVATE SECTOR ECONOMY

Moscow TRUD in Russian 11 Dec 83 p 3

[Article by Yu. Mayorov and N. Shevtsov, special correspondents of TRUD in the column "Along Countries and Continents": "From the Sea to the Desert"]

[Excerpt] It can be said today that Algeria has reached the first stage in her struggle to establish a modern multi-sector economy. Once an agrarian country, Algeria has become one of the industrially developed Mediterranean states. It is enough to point out that Algeria has achieved a gross national product earnestly approaching that of Spain, has caught up with that of Yugoslavia, and outstripped such countries as Egypt, Turkey, and Morocco.

The key strategic link for development has been industrialization, based on the institution of state control over vitally important sectors of the economy, with the adaptation of central planning.

Almost in every developing country there are cities and institutions which serve as a symbol of vital stability and creative inspiration for the people. Annaba is a city on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, not far from the Tunisian border. It is known for its glorious traditions in the struggle for liberation. To this day, one can meet on its streets women covered in black, mourning the victims of the anticolonial revolt in May of 1945. It was ruthlessly crushed by the French army. In a few days more than 30,000 men died in Annaba and its environs.

The dialectic of revolutionary growth is a complex one. At present, the country has available financial, technical, and manpower resources to reach higher levels. And at the same time in the conduct of its national economy, Algeria has many problems and unsolved questions. This is the kind of experience, however, that is not easily acquired. Thus, economic indicators show that there is much to be desired in a number of enterprises in the state sector; planned discipline and proportionality of the national economy are not always observed.

The situation is particularly complicated in agriculture. In large measure this can be explained by its colonial heritage, which was based, on the whole, on the development of export crops, and obstacles to building up the economy. As is true for the majority of developing countries, Algeria has

not achieved a level of production where it can feed itself. Not only is a great quantity of wheat imported, but also forage crops. The volume of food products constitutes one-fifth of its imports, which, of course, decreases the importation of capital equipment. In addition, food dependency on imperialism is an unquestionable threat to national sovereignty.

Algeria is a young country in the full sense of the word. The annual increase in population here is more than 3 percent, which appears to be a very high indicator. The Algerian families number among the largest in the world. The cities are growing rapidly. Suffice it to say that the population of the capital quadrupled in 20 years. Such a rapid urbanization aggravates the housing problem and many municipal problems. For example, with the exception of buses there is no public transportation in Algeria. They have just gotten around to building a subway....

The country is full of resolve to solve these and many other problems more quickly. But how best to do it? A persistent search in various directions is on the way.

The private sector has come to life. Right now, a major part of construction jobs fall to its lot, as well as a large volume of textile and leather industry. Recently, private capital was allowed to take a hand in the tourist trade. And, of course, there is trade.

Our hotel was in the center of the capital city. Next to the hotel there were about 10 private stores. We entered one of them, an outer clothing store. The salesman met us pleasantly; we were rare customers. A cat was softly snoring right on the cash register: it is not disturbed very often. We looked at the prices and it all became clear....

Certainly a revolution is not made in tails and dinner jackets. One also needs suit coats. The legend that private capital can quickly and cheaply bury the population in goods awaits its expected fiasco. No, private capital means, first of all, uncontrolled growth in prices wherever it is practiced. Algeria is no exception. Although in the country prices are firm on basic foods, complete control over the market has not been successful. It is not by accident that at one of the NLF Central Committee plenums, they stressed the necessity to protect city and village toilers from uncontrolled private ownership elements, who, in addition to everything else, want to push the country off the path of socio-economic reforms.

What role will private capital and small-scale industry play in the life of the society? The question is a very urgent one for many countries of the continent. Frequently, it is precisely here that the main direction of the class struggle is changed.

Algeria has someone to lean on in its construction of a new life. The Soviet Union is a reliable friend on whom Algeria can depend.

Collaboration of the two countries has fine traditions and carries a constructive character. With the help of the USSR, in Algeria there were built

and are being built about 100 projects. Among them are such large ones as a second section of the metallurgical plant in el Hadjar, a gas pipeline between Hassi Messaoud and Tin Fouye and others.

All-encompassing and mutually beneficial collaboration between our countries is progressing in many directions and has a good prospect for further growth.

Today the country is preparing for the fifth NLF Congress, which will examine the main direction of the development of the national economy of the republic in the next Five-Year Plan.

The city of Algiers awakens early, and even the loud-speaker amplified voices of the muezzin cannot stop the noise of the large city. Its inhabitants have many cares. Much has been accomplished in the years of revolution. But even more remains to be done, and we must value time.

12598
CSO: 1807/95

INTERNATIONAL

SPANISH SOCIALISTS' RECORD IN POWER SINCE ELECTION ASSESSED

Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No 49, 2-8 Dec 83 pp 12-13

[Article written especially for ZA RUBEZHOM by Vladimir Chernyshev, journalist specializing in international affairs and correspondent for PRAVDA in Spain: "Spain: A Difficult Twelve Months"]

[Text] Madrid--The results of the socialist government's first year in power in Spain have not proved to be as significant as expected by supporters of the Spanish Socialist Workers Party, who ensured its impressive victory in last year's parliamentary elections. Despite a number of positive aspects, a crisis situation still exists in the economy. In the foreign policy area Spaniards are deeply troubled by the central question of the country's participation in NATO, the resolution of which has been postponed indefinitely by the government.

In late October the Spanish Socialist Workers Party (SSWP) celebrated at its headquarters in Madrid the anniversary of its victory in the parliamentary elections. More than 500 participants in the celebration, including members of the government, deputies and senators, leaders of regional and provincial organizations of socialists and the General Union of Workers (the trade union confederation which is oriented toward the SSWP), artists, writers and journalists gathered in an assembly hall, in the "family circle," so to speak. There was no lack of speeches, toasts, bouquets of red roses (this flower is the symbol of the party) and, of course, loud pronouncements about the socialists' achievements during their year in power, although the attitude of the press and the leaders of the opposition parties to them is more than restrained.

And what does the government led by Felipe Gonzalez include among its accomplishments? Since the end of last year the cabinet of

ministers has sent to parliament about 100 bills, many of which have been debated and adopted. These laws give concrete form to the provisions of the new constitution; they fill in the gaps in Spanish legislation which developed as a result of the repeal of Franco's emergency decrees.

The country's "autonomy process," which was begun under the government of the Union of the Democratic Center, has been completed. In accordance with the constitution, 17 autonomous areas have been established. This process was complex and at times painful. Many sharp debates arose while work was being carried out on the development of the legal provisions, which were called upon to take into account all of the diverse national, historical and cultural features of every region in Spain. In May, elections for the autonomous parliaments were held and organs of power were created. However, the process of transferring to them a number of functions which previously came under the jurisdiction of the central administration is taking place relatively slowly, and this provokes serious criticism from the local authorities.

The liquidation of the "Rumasa" Empire

Among the initiatives in the government's list of accomplishments the socialists single out reforms of school and university education, the development of a new criminal code, the adoption of a law which shortens the working week and increases vacations, the preparation of administrative reforms and the nationalization of high voltage power transmission lines.

However, the decision to expropriate the powerful Rumasa concern has prompted the greatest response in the country.

This company (Ruiz Mateos, who heads the list of Spain's wealthiest people, was its president) owned 18 banks, 400 enterprises and a network of magazines and hotels. It had turned into a kind of state within a state. The bee (the Rumasa symbol) collected tribute from virtually the entire country. The concern bought up enterprises, companies and firms one after another and several months before its expropriation it laid its hands on the three largest chains of department and food stores. The Rumasa beehive grew every day. In this connection one of the newspapers wrote with irony: "The only way to get the country out of its economic crisis is to sell Spain to Rumasa."

It seemed that nothing threatened this financial-industrial empire. The first thunder was heard when Miguel Boyer, minister of economy, finance and commerce, unexpectedly accused the concern of trying to hide the scale of its operations and the state of affairs at the enterprises and banks which came under it. The Madrid newspaper, DIARIO-16, wrote at that time: "For the first

time since the concern of the "little bee" was established, a member of the government is making statements which cast doubt on the solidity of this economic empire."

At a press conference (the first in many years) the president of Rumasa stated that the concern had become an "object of aggression unprecedented in the history of Spain" and "someone is interested in provoking a catastrophe." The explanations of Spain's number one capitalist were directed primarily at calming investors, who withdrew about 2 billion pesetas (1,000 pesetas = 5.01 rubles) from Rumasa banks the next day.

The government's reaction was immediate. Ruiz Mateos and the Spaniards learned about it from the evening news. Later M. Boyer explained in the Congress of Deputies (the lower chamber of parliament) that over a long period of time the concern had violated financial laws, covered up the real state of affairs at the enterprises and banks which belonged to it and had failed to pay state taxes exceeding 60 billion pesetas. As it turned out, the total "shortfall" amounted to about 250 billion pesetas. The case concerning Rumasa's machinations was handed over to the courts, and Ruiz Mateos hurriedly took off for London, from where he heaps curses upon the government of the socialists, accusing it of attempting to destroy sacred private property.

The expropriation of the powerful concern was undertaken within the framework of the work to implement the government's plan for the "recovery" of the economy. And it is economic problems which currently disturb the socialists most of all; they recognize that the voters' judgment of the authorities' actions will depend largely on the effectiveness of the struggle against the economic crisis.

Some successes have been achieved on this front. For example, the rate of growth in inflation has been slowed down; according to predictions it will amount to 12 percent this year, i.e., it will prove to be at its lowest level in recent years. The foreign trade balance has been improved somewhat as a result of measures promoting Spanish exports (it is expected that by the end of the year total exports will increase 5.5 percent, and exports of agricultural output will increase 10 percent). As a result, the country's foreign currency reserves grew by \$473 million in September and October alone; last year they fell by \$1.423 billion during the same months.

No one in the country disputes the need to take decisive measures to bring industry out of its prolonged crisis, but many consider that the path chosen by the socialists is far from being the best one.

The unpopularity of the government's plans for the "recovery" of the metallurgical industry, for example, was shown by the events at the combine in Sagunto (Valencia). Three combines two state ones (in Sagunto and Asturia) and one which has private capital (in the Basque Country) smelt the lion's share of steel in Spain. However, production significantly exceeds national requirements. The Common Market member states which once bought willingly the relatively cheap Spanish metal, are themselves experiencing a crisis in this industry and have been forced to close down many enterprises. Thus, the foreign market has proved to be virtually closed for Spanish steel. A paradoxical situation has been created in which, as one economist estimates, it is more advantageous for the government to lay off all the Sagunto metallurgical workers and to pay them wages for the rest of their lives than it is to continue to smelt metal there. In the opinion of the Sagunto engineers and technicians, the combine needs up-to-date equipment and technology which would make it possible for the plant to produce high quality special steels, for which demand is growing and which Spain is forced to import from abroad. However, the government came to the conclusion that it is more profitable to update the equipment at the enterprises in Asturia and to close down the blast furnaces and open hearth furnaces in Sagunto.

Economic "recovery" through production cuts

Since that decision was made the metallurgical workers at Sagunto have held 12 strikes, demanding that it be changed, because it condemns more than 5,000 people to unemployment. The residents of Sagunto have held three marches in Madrid. During the last march, which was held in early November, 10,000 demonstrators gathered at the Congress of Deputies. A delegation of metallurgical workers handed over to the Congress the draft of a law which calls for the preservation of the combine. The draft was signed by about 700,000 people; their signatures filled 68 large volumes (according to the constitution, if the initiative for a bill does not come from a parliamentary group, 500,000 signatures are necessary to introduce a bill into the Congress of Deputies). And that evening a demonstration took place at the Ministry of Industry and Energy. The wives of the metallurgical workers banged empty pots and pans continuously and shouted: "What shall we give the children to eat tomorrow?" Miguel Campoy, chairman of the production committee at the metallurgical combine, stated: "The authorities will be able to close the enterprise only if the army interferes, if the delivery of raw materials, especially coke, is stopped or the supply of electrical power is cut off. We retain the fighting spirit and will continue the struggle."

Shipbuilding is next in line behind the metallurgical industry for "recovery." According to the data from the National Institute of Industry, the production capacities of Spanish shipyards make

it possible to produce ships with a total water displacement of 850,000 tons. But the demand for ships in 1986 is expected to be at the level of 180,000-200,000 tons, and in 1990 it is expected to be about 300,000 tons. The losses of just two state enterprises, RESA and Astano, will amount to nearly 30 billion pesetas this year, and next year, "if appropriate measures are not taken," they will amount to 40 billion. Thus the question of closing a number of shipbuilding enterprises comes to be on the agenda. But which enterprises? There have not yet been any clarifications issued on this subject, but it was announced that 20,000 out of 43,000 shipbuilders are "superfluous." Strikes are breaking out one after another at the shipyards these days; the participants are protesting against plans which call for the closing down of shipyards. "If it is necessary, we are prepared to declare war against the administration," say the strikers.

The government's economic plans also call for the "recovery" of the textile and food industries, the production of household goods and certain other industries.

If all these plans result in the laying off of thousands of workers, as in the case of the metallurgical combine at Sagunto, then how will the socialists fulfill one of their basic campaign promises, which was to create 800,000 new jobs in four years? This question continues to be discussed on the pages of the newspapers.

Unemployment became Spain's most acute problem a long time ago. And it is no accident that last year the socialists put forward as their main card in the campaign battle a promise to solve the problem or at least to reduce it. It is thought that this slogan attracted a significant portion of the voters who are in the army of the unemployed or who have hanging over them the threat of becoming "superfluous people." However, at present many of them talk with pessimism about this point of the socialists' program. In June, Carlos Solchaga, the minister of industry and energy, stated directly that he does not believe that is possible to create 800,000 new jobs. This admission provoked a great response throughout the country. Both Felipe Gonzalez, head of the government, and his deputy, Alfonso Guerra, hastened to reaffirm the campaign promise. However, their statements were already sounding less confident than previously. At present the discussion concerns the impossibility of expecting any tangible results immediately, as well as the prediction that the "first rays" will appear only 1984 and that only in the future (in the last two years of the socialists' mandate) will the situation on the labor front improve.

And in fact, nearly every day during the summer the labor exchanges registered an average of a thousand new unemployed. In October their number grew 44 percent. Within the first 10

months the army of "superfluous people" grew 5.3 percent and reached 2.4 million people, or 18 percent of the able-bodied population. And it should be added here that only 24 percent of the unemployed receive benefits.

The march for agrarian reform

When the column of unemployed peasants left Seville, it numbered about 1,000 people. The next day 700 day-laborers joined it from the villages surrounding the route of the peasants' march for agrarian reform. In 42 days the new participants walked through more than 1,000 kilometers through the provinces of Andalusia. The column was not always so large. Some people joined it in their own village, walked about 10 or so kilometers through their own region and returned home. But in the next village the marchers would find a new group waiting, and in this way the human river flowed and flowed along the Andalusian roads.

The purpose of the march, which was held at the initiative of the trade union confederation of the Workers Commissions, was to explain to the peasants the essence of that agrarian reform, which the Spanish countryside needs, and to mobilize rural workers to struggle for this reform, as well as for land and the right to work. This was discussed at rallies, which were held all along the column's path. Everywhere the population greeted the marchers warmly, gave them lodgings for the night and organized free food service under awnings in the village squares.

When the marchers had covered the seven provinces of Andalusia, they returned to their starting point in Seville and were greeted by more than 15,000 people. Delegations had also come here from Madrid, Catalonia, Valencia and other regions of the country. A large rally was held at San Francisco Square, and its main slogan was a demand that agrarian reform be carried out and that the landless day-laborers (and they are the majority in Andalusia) be provided with the right to work.

Ten days after the march of the day-laborers ended Rafael Escuredo, the chairman of the Andalusian autonomous government, made a ceremonial presentation in Carmona of a bill on agrarian reform in Andalusia. However, the peasants who had awaited this document with such hope were disappointed. "Agrarian reform, this dream cherished for so long by the Andalusian people, is not destined to be realized," writes the magazine, ACTUAL. It all comes down to the fact that the autonomous government does not have the power to carry out real agrarian reform, and that the bill represents only a summary of the measures and laws which have at one time been adopted by the centerist governments but not carried out. The old structures of underdevelopment do not yet have alternatives."

The communist deputies in the Andalusian parliament stated that they would vote against this draft. Felipe Alcaras, the general secretary of the Andalusian Communist Party, said: "With this document they are attempting to mix water and olive oil, to satisfy both the landowners and the day-laborers, and this is impossible. They have taken the music from our agrarian reform program, but they have added different words which are completely unsuitable. The draft is no more than an attempt to gather together all the laws which have proven their uselessness." The confederation of the Workers Commissions and the Trade Union of Agricultural Workers subjected the document to sharp criticism.

In Andalusia they are at least trying to find ways to resolve the problems of the countryside, but on a nation-wide scale no substantial transformations are being planned for the agricultural sector. Carlos Romero, the minister of agriculture, stated recently in conversation with journalists that "the ministry has no plan for agrarian reform. It will limit itself to fulfillment of the existing legislation. The land can be utilized successfully without changes in land use." Incidentally, two percent of the wealthiest families in Spain own half of the land suitable for cultivation. Andalusia alone has 2,200 estates which have over 500 hectares of land each. As Francisco Casero, leader of the trade union of agricultural workers, stated recently, with the kind of agrarian reform which is planned in Andalusia, the land-owners will be able to sleep soundly.

Terrorism--a threat to democratic gains

Undoubtedly one must include terrorism among the acute and painful problems which Spain is now facing. The mass demonstrations which were held throughout Spain in late October provided evidence of the deep concern on the part of the public, the political parties and the trade unions, which see in the growth of terrorism a threat to democratic achievements and stability in the country against the bloody crimes of the terrorist bands. In Madrid the following people all marched together: Alfonso Guerra, deputy prime minister; Manuel Fraga Iribarne, leader of the rightist opposition party; Gerardo Iglesias, general secretary of the Spanish Communist Party; Adolfo Suarez, former head of the centerists; Marcelino Camacho, general secretary of the trade union confederation of the Workers Commissions and Ferer Salat, chairman of the Employers Association. Since the February 1981 demonstration, which was held immediately after the failure of the attempted military overthrow, the Spanish capital has not seen such an impressive demonstration, one which brought together such a broad spectrum of socio-political forces.

The demonstration, which was called by the socialist workers party, the communist and people's parties, the "popular alliance", as well as by the democratic and social center and the

liberal alliance, in addition to the largest trade union associations--the Workers Commissions and the General Alliance of Workers--and two confederations of employers, was held in connection with the death of a captain in the medical service, Alberto Martin Barrios.

On the morning of 5 October, when Martin was going to work at the military governorship in the province of Biscay (in the Basque Country), where he headed the pharmaceutical department, he was kidnapped. The next day the extremist organization ETA sent by way of the mass media a letter in which it reported that Martin was in its hands and that his fate depended on whether nine ETA members who were supposed to face a military tribunal for an attack on the site of a military unit in Berga, would be released. The next day ETA demanded that Central Television of Spain broadcast on its evening and night news programs the extremist organization's complete statement, which set out the ETA viewpoint on the events in Berga. The television management answered that it was prepared to meet the kidnappers' conditions only if Captain Martin was freed. Two weeks after Martin was kidnapped, he was found dead in the vicinity of Bilbao.

The reaction of the public, the political parties and the official organs was practically unanimous. The council of Ministers published a statement in which it noted that the government shared the Spaniards' indignation and did not intend to give in to the terrorists' blackmail in regard to the state and Spanish society. The secretariat of the Spanish Communist Party Central Committee judged the murder to be an obvious provocation directed against the the armed forces.

A special session of the Congress of Deputies was held on the problems of the struggle against terrorism. The head of the government, Felipe Gonzalez, spoke at the session, which was held on 3 November. He reported on a series of measures which the cabinet of ministers intended to take. All the political forces represented in parliament supported (some with certain reservations) the measures outlined by the government. Speaking from the platform of the Congress, Felipe Gonzalez stated that the political ways to eliminate terrorism had been virtually exhausted and that there could be no talk of negotiating with the extremists.

While the parliamentarians more or less agreed on some questions (this, by the way, happens relatively infrequently), on others their views are diametrically opposed.

Heated debates on foreign policy

In no other area besides foreign policy has the criticism of the government reached such unanimity among the opposition forces and

the various strata of the population. In late October this subject was discussed in the Congress of Deputies for two days.

Speaking from the parliamentary platform, Fernando Moran, the minister of foreign affairs confirmed the intention of the present cabinet to hold a referendum on Spain's membership in NATO. However, despite the demand by a number of deputies, he did not name a specific date for calling the referendum. The minister confirmed that Spain's participation in the North Atlantic bloc did not limit the country's opportunities in the international arena and that "until the referendum is held, Spain will faithfully carry out the obligations which it undertook when it signed a treaty with Washington." At the same time F. Moran noted that Spain is not bound by the decisions previously taken by NATO in which it did not participate, specifically on the question of locating American medium range nuclear missiles in Europe; he also stated that the country will not join the NATO military organization and will not participate in actions which go beyond the framework of the Atlantic treaty.

The opposition deputies judged the activities of the socialist cabinet in the international area to be duplicitous and they stated that the minister of foreign affairs had not provided concrete answers to the questions which were worrying Spaniards more and more.

F. Moran confirmed those positions which were well known to the deputies on the basis of his previous statements. The attempts by a number of deputies to get from Moran a clear answer on the question of the socialist government's attitude toward Spain's participation in NATO did not yield any results.

Political observers note that when they talk about Spain's integration into the North Atlantic bloc, the language of the socialists differs significantly from the language which they spoke when they were in opposition. Here they frequently recall the resounding phrase uttered by F. Gonzalez in the Congress during the discussion of the centerists bill on joining NATO. At that time the leader of the socialists stated that just as the centerists are drawing Spain into NATO by using the existence of a majority vote among the deputies, the decision to leave NATO will be taken in just the same way--by a simple majority of votes in the Congress, when the socialists gain a majority. They gained this majority in the parliamentary elections during October of last year. And now what? The question of resolving the problem of NATO membership by parliamentary means is not even being posed. And it will not be posed because even in their pre-election platform the socialists stated that Spaniards must express themselves on this issue through a general referendum. Everyone was hoping that a referendum on this burning issue would be held soon after the formation of the socialist govern-

ment. However, F. Gonzalez stated at first that the development of international events did not favor the holding of a referendum for Spaniards, but during a visit to the United States he stated that a referendum will be held no earlier than 1985. And what if the international situation at that time does not favor the socialists?

The demand that Spain leave NATO has become the basic slogan of Spanish antiwar organizations and of massive demonstrations in defense of peace and for disarmament, which are held from time to time throughout the country. The demonstrators demand as well the liquidation of American military bases on Spanish territory, because they consider them the source of a serious threat to the country's security. Recently the movement to declare Spanish cities nuclear-free zones has spread widely. It was started in Madrid in June of this year at a conference of mayors from the capitals and other major cities of Europe, which came out in favor of active efforts by the municipalities in defense of peace, detente and disarmament. At present more than 60 Spanish cities have declared that they will not permit nuclear weapons to be produced or located on their territory.

The problem of Spain's entry into the Common Market also arouses sharp polemics. Here the political parties represented in parliament are more unanimous than they are on NATO membership, although there are certain shades in their positions. Leaders of "The Ten" who come to visit Madrid spare no loud words in expressing warm support for Spain's aspiration to become a member of the European Economic Community. But in fact, Madrid is encountering numerous obstacles which some of these leaders, primarily those from France, put in Spain's path to the Common Market. Upon his return from Athens, where a meeting had taken place of leaders from five European states--Greece, Italy, France, Portugal and Spain--that is, from the countries which have governments headed by socialists, Felipe Gonzalez stated with irritation that if the Common Market did not demonstrate a clear desire to accept Spain into its family, then Madrid would be forced to re-examine its economic policy, which is oriented toward the countries of "The Ten." The matter had reached the point at which an SSWP delegation, which had recently arrived at a congress of French socialists, walked out as a sign of protest against France's position on the issue of Spain's membership in the EEC.

Both in Spain itself and in a majority of the European capitals a positive assessment has been given to the Spanish government's efforts in successfully concluding the Madrid meeting of the representative participant states at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Spanish socialists would like the expression "the spirit of Madrid" to become a symbol of the willingness of states to look for and find mutually acceptable

solutions to the very difficult international situation. However, the campaign unleashed by certain mass information media in Spain, which is aimed against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, clearly goes against the aspiration of the European peoples for mutual understanding and cooperation.

The bridge of friendship between Madrid and Moscow

A bronze Pushkin stands thoughtfully beside an iron fence. Around him there is a riot of color. Even in these late autumn days the southern plants are striking with their abundance of bright blooms. The sculpture of the great Russian poet, which was given by Moscow to the Spanish people, was set up in Fuente del Berro Park in 1980.

And in the Moscow Friendship of Peoples Park the monument to the great Spanish writer Cervantes stands covered with the first snow. The sculpture of the author of the famous novel about the adventures of the valiant knight Don Quixote and his famous follower Sancho Panza was unveiled in November 1981, when the Madrid Days were held in Moscow.

And recently some Muscovites paid a return visit to the Spanish capital at the invitation of its mayor. A delegation from the Moscow Soviet, headed by V.F. Promyslov, took part in the opening ceremonies for the Moscow Days in Madrid, and it also visited Segovia, Samora, Valladolik and other Spanish cities, where it was given a warm, friendly reception.

During the week the hall of the Madrid Cultural Center in which Soviet artists gave concerts was filled to overflowing. Madrid residents came with their entire families long before the start of the performances in order to claim seats in the hall, which could not accommodate everyone wishing to enter. Many came to the capital from other cities.

Also filled to overflowing was the neighboring hall, where there was a showing of Soviet feature and documentary films and cartoons, and in the Palace of Sports there were exhibitions by Soviet masters of athletic and artistic gymnastics, as well as friendly competitions with a Madrid team.

Every day thousands of Spaniards visited the cultural center to see a large exhibit entitled "Moscow--the Capital of the USSR." The visitors looked for a long time at models of the residential sections of Moscow and learned about the experience of residential and municipal construction in the Soviet capital.

And there were vain efforts (which appeared pathetic) by certain rightist figures to demonstrate opposition to "contact with the

"Russians" and to join the malicious anti-Soviet campaign which is being fanned by the American administration. Even those organs of the right-wing press which--in connection with the holding of the Moscow Days--at first called for people to "turn their backs on the Russians," were forced in the end to recognize the complete failure of the attempts at a boycott. The ceaseless ovations which the spectators gave the presentations by Soviet artists and athletes and the comments written in the book set out for people to write in express not only admiration of the Muscovites for their high level of skill, but also an unambiguous response to those who are attempting to fan anti-Soviet hysteria, to those who use the most despicable fabrications and open provocations, and who attempt to interfere with the strengthening of trust and mutual understanding, and with the development of fruitful cooperation between countries and peoples which desire to live on a peaceful planet.

The overwhelming majority of Spaniards wants to maintain friendly relations with all peoples and desires the development of fruitful cooperation with all countries, regardless of their social systems; they want to live in peace. In the name of these noble goals thousands and thousands of Spaniards have been going to antiwar demonstrations, which are spreading at this time like an untamed wave throughout the country.

PHOTO CAPTION

Hundreds of thousands of residents of Madrid, Catalonia, Andalusia, Burgos and other provinces and cities of Spain are participating actively in the powerful popular demonstrations which are taking place throughout Western Europe against the deployment of American first strike nuclear weapons on the continent and against Washington's militaristic course.

In the picture: an antiwar demonstration in Madrid. EFE-TASS photo.

8543
CSO: 1807/97

NATIONAL

KUZNETSOV CITES LITERARY MISSION, WRITER'S RESPONSIBILITY

Moscow LITERATURNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Rukssian No 10, Oct 83 pp 3-7

[Article by F. Kuznetsov, board first secretary of Moscow Writers Organization of the RSFSR Writers Union: "The Time Calls!"]

[Excerpts] The June Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, its decisions and the speeches of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Comrade Yu.V. Andropov at the plenum and at the meeting with party veterans contain a long-term program of action in our ideological work and in the matter of ideological, spiritual and moral education of people. These are documents of historical importance, which will shortly be determining our life and the development of the multinational Soviet literature.

These documents of the party are marked by a deep, precise approach to life and to the contemporary stage of our social development. They are a kind of banner of the time and express its basic social needs. They are characterized by freshness, clarity and elevation of truly Marxist theoretical thinking, honesty and sobriety of analysis of the historical time we are going through--an epoch of mature, developed socialism, a truly state, deeply party approach to life and its most complex and occasionally still unsolved problems. I would say--a sober and strict approach expressing the feelings and aspirations of millions of Soviet people. Fervor of patriotic pride for the achievements of our people is organically recast here with a call to precision and a realistic view of life and depth of scientific analysis of reality.

Today we are largely thinking of the future of our literary and social development because what has been done will remain with thus. Thus, thinking of the future, I would like to direct attention to those painful nerve nodes of our literary development which in my opinion were designated with special acuteness at the June Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

I selected four groups of problems that in my view stem from the materials of the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee--if I am not restricted to the section directly concerned with literature and take its materials as a whole.

First: the strongly growing role of social-philosophical, investigative and civic thought in artistic creative work.

Second: the problem of the artist's position--moral, social and civic--put much more acutely than at any time previously.

Third: the problem of conflict and the hero in literary work largely turning in a new way.

And, finally, fourth: the question of ideological-artistic quality, worth of literature and of the special, fundamental, I would see, determining social role of literary criticism formulated with unusual pointedness by the party.

In the contemporary world, the artist is bound to occupy his own special place: to be forward-looking. And there to be at the same time a politician, a philosopher, an ideologist, an economist and without fail a "fighter in the world," that is, a citizen. From this, the problem grows of the artist's position as one of the basic problems of creativity. It is at times spoken of simplistically. In this the fault lies with criticism, which sometimes presents the author's position as that of a "pointing finger." Such an interpretation is basically incorrect. In the traditions of the great Russian, Soviet literature, the position of the artist lies in maturity of his spirit, moral greatness, his view of the world, his relationship to the people and to life. The main element in the artist's position has always been his world outlook, his civic and moral convictions.

What is disturbing today when one analyzes the literary process?

First of all, the inadequate civic maturity of certain writers.

An extreme form of manifestation of this fault is the tacit principle of non-participation and not being implicated in our common affairs. And then there appears from this a mode of a narrow understanding of life, of "triangles," of reducing all and everything to personal relations with people. Then you have a "skimmed" Trifonov without the pain and social consciousness of the real Trifonov. Then you have the emergence of a whining hero, life's impasses--in a word, literary trash of which, unfortunately, we have more than enough today....

There is also another manifestation of inadequate civic maturity. This is a kind of formalism and, I would say, careerism in literature where you have speculation on exciting themes, when people begin to work on topical and burning civic themes and do not resolve them lightly, not showing the real complexity of life, the depth and beat of civic passions. As a result you get declarative, "cardboard" works filled with "cardboard" heroes, flat one day things, which provide nothing and could give nothing to anyone.

The words of Comrade Yu.V. Andropov addressed to party veterans on the use of their unique life experience in the education of the upcoming generation can help with their correct formulation work with creative young people.

And that assessment which Comrade Yu.V. Andropov gave to contemporary youth--"The overwhelming majority of today's young people are active participants in the building of communism, worthy inheritors and continuers of the work of their fathers. But namely against such a general background, the eyes are offended

by cases of parasitism, work and social passivity characteristic of a certain portion of the youth."--are fully applicable to the writing milieu.

Moods of social passivity are characteristic, unfortunately, of certain young writers. They find their reflection in works filled, as was said at the June Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, with "such uncontrolled whining characters rooting in their life's squabbles."

In the establishment of a literary succession, we have to remember that the artist's civic position has been and continues to be the originating element in his work. Only a party approach helps one to understand the leading tendencies of contemporaneity. "Real talent," Comrade K.U. Chernenko emphasized in an address at the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, "does not cut itself off from life, does not permit either cheap embellishment of reality or artificial stressing of shady phenomena."

At the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, concern was voiced over deviation from historical truth in certain works, for example, in assessment of collectivization, "God-seeking" themes occasionally seeping through, idealization of patriarchy. It sometimes happens that an author sets himself a task beyond his capabilities and as a result loses himself in complex life problems or attempts to make a splash with their "nonstandard" interpretation and once again you get a distortion of our reality.

Such problems are the consequences of an insufficiently high level of a social-moral-philosophical level of comprehension, an unexacting world view and sometimes irresponsibility on the part of the artist.

The times require of us great adherence to principle in the evaluation of literary works that would put to one side considerations of group, position, friendship--in a word any nonliterary considerations. "Additions," unfortunately are to be found in literature. Our duty is to provide an honest, principled evaluation of literary works, not to overpraise those books which are weak and below the level of talent and capabilities of this or that writer, below the artistic level achieved by Soviet literature's best works. "Additions" to literature begin the moment an average, undistinguished and sometimes even a frankly dull work is passed off on the basis of one consideration or another as an achievement of the writer and sometimes even possibly of all literature. As we know, even a most sound conception does not provide an artistic or moral effect with mediocre application and frequently does outright damage.

The party shows us an example of truly party, civic adherence to principle, interest in the results of work and in its effectiveness. And we need to seek in creative work approaches that are maximally effective--if we keep in mind the emotional impact of literature on readers.

From time immemorial, a basic, fundamental problem of literary creativity has been the problem in a literary work of conflict and the hero.

The literature of socialist realism is distinguished by zeal of affirmation of life and extolment of our reality. But zeal of life affirmation is unthinkable

without struggling against all that which interferes with the life of people and of the people as a nation.

The party requires of literature a maximally deep study of the life and work of Soviet people, affirmation of positive principles in the struggle against everything that hinders us from moving forward.

For an understanding of the problem of conflict and the hero, two initial factors are extremely important: first, the task of improving the society of mature socialism and, second, the struggle of opposites as a dialectical law of social development. And although the contradictions of mature socialism are not antagonistic contradictions, the need to resolve them is obvious. For writers, the following law of literature must be clear: without conflict, without struggle, there can be no real hero of our time.

The question of socially significant conflict, maximally accurate and deep investigation and its comprehension through conflict of the hero of our time is of major significance to a writer. It is specifically in this way that such heroes as Chapayev, Davydov and Papka Korchagin were discovered in literature. These characters won our hearts through struggle with those circumstances which socialism overcame in its forward movement, and it was not an easy struggle. And what artistic courage was required in the investigation of the real circumstances of this struggle!

If one were to think of our tasks from the positions of the June Plenum, artistic courage and acuteness of social vision, strength and principled character of social thinking and a state view of life would be required first of all of the contemporary writer. Along this route there in fact would be created genuinely artistic works, affirming our reality. Only in this way, in complex, difficult and honest searches is it possible for books to appear which do not just reach the reader's heart but also stay on to live through the centuries. Yu.V. Andropov in his speech at the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee defined the goals and tasks of our literary development as follows: "The party supports everything that enriches science and culture and helps to educate workers in the spirit of the norms and principles of developed socialism. It carefully and respectfully deals with talents and the artist's creative search without interfering with the forms and style of his work. But the party cannot be indifferent to the ideological content of art. It will always direct the development of art in such a way that it serves the interests of the people. The chief method of influencing artistic creativity must be Marxist-Leninist criticism, active, sensitive, attentive and at the same time intransigent with respect to alien and professionally weak works."

We think that no other genre, no other type of art heard such significant, such important and such responsible words at the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee as literary artistic criticism! This in large measure is a new look at the role and significance of literary criticism, elevating without precedent the genre itself while at the same time sharply increasing the responsibility of criticism.

Let us recall V.G. Belinskiy--not only his widely known formula where he defines criticism as "moving esthetics," but also his other definition of criticism as a "philosophical consciousness of literature." Should our criticism rise to such a level, it would truly be the chief method of influencing the literary process. It is important for literary critical thought to be specifically what it should be--"philosophical consciousness of literature." Marxist-Leninist philosophical consciousness of literature.

The potential of our criticism is sufficiently great. Paraphrasing the well-known saying, it is possible to put it thus: every literature has the criticism that it deserves. In Soviet literature today, a whole pleiad of critics is at work who can be compared in authority, level and quality of their thought to the leading prose writers.

And still it is necessary to say with all honesty and candor that on the whole contemporary criticism continues to do a poor job of fulfilling the decree of the party's Central Committee on literary artistic criticism and that it is tremendously indebted to readers and to the literature. Here two reasons can be cited.

The first reason is theoretical and philosophical confusion. And there is more than enough of the one and the other in our literary critical work.

A second defect, a second problem exists. The critic is not a master of the oral genre. Literary criticism is not some kind of stage genre. Criticism does not exist outside of literary-art journals and newspapers. And we say outright: the potential and capabilities of our criticism are a great deal higher than what is shown today in the pages of our newspapers and journals. In order to solve seriously problems set at the June Plenum of the party's Central Committee, it is necessary to be fair and to have criticism and the press equally share responsibility for the failures. Both criticism and the periodical press, our newspapers and journals are equally to blame for inadequate adherence to principles. Stating it plainly, the press so far has not been stimulating the appearance of penetrating, truly analytical and demanding articles of literary criticism.

I believe that we are going to reach another position where literary criticism will receive a lot of freedom on the pages of the literary press for the fulfillment of the tasks and decisions that were adopted in the course of the June Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The June Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee has created to a large degree qualitatively new conditions for our work. Soviet writers, prosaists, poets, playwrights, publicists and critics will not spare effort to put at their disposal the powerful tool of serving the cause of the people and the cause of communism as well as possible.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Literaturnoye obozreniye", 1983

7697

CSO: 1800/185

NATIONAL

SOME SOVIET WAR MOVIES CRITICIZED

[Editorial Report] PM131148 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 January 1984 carries on page 2 a 2,500-word article by O. Kuchkina entitled "Not About the War...: Polemical Comments on Some Movies on the Subject of War." Kuchkina subjects a number of Soviet movies on World War II to criticism, saying that young people need movies "which will show them not only how to behave in war, in a situation of extreme danger, but how to live in general." However, in the writer's view, some movies have failed in this through "striking lack of concreteness, approximateness, and the 'generality' which is so fatal to art."

CSO: 1830/209

END